NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DCXLV.

AUGUST, 1909.

SOCIALISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

BY THE REV. PERCY STICKNEY GRANT.

THE Church, some recent critics have pointed out, is trying to get back to the people. This undertaking is unmasked as if it were a plot—a sly attempt at material rehabilitation, with an eye to an increase of ecclesiastical power. As a matter of fact, the democratizing of the Church is a healthy instinct and an evidence of leadership. All our institutions might well follow its example. None needs to get back to the people more than our Government itself; more democracy is its only salvation. Lowell, a quarter of a century ago, called American democracy an experiment. To-day it is still more of an experiment, because farther from the ideals of its founders. The democratizing of the Church is not an ecclesiastical programme; but it is the attempt of an originally popular organization to set its own house in order and to oppose the undemocratic tendencies—the plutocratic and oligarchical tendencies of our times.

During the last two years the Church of the Ascension, in New York, has been holding Sunday-evening services for working-men. The preacher has been Mr. Alexander Irvine, once a working-man himself, now a member of labor unions and of the Socialist Party. Mr. Irvine is a man of wide experience and sympathies, a brilliant writer and an eloquent and influential

Copyright, 1909, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speaker. At the conclusion of the service in church, which lasts an hour, there is an after-meeting in the adjoining Parish House, which is addressed by some expert,—like the chairman of a commission, a college professor, a philanthropist, a socialistic leader, a man of letters or the head of a city department. Some of our recent speakers have been Professor Dickinson S. Miller, Professor Edwin R. A. Seligman, Professor Henry Crampton, Mr. Edwin Markham, Mr. Fulton Cutting, Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Dr. Darlington and Commissioner Hebberd. After the address there are questions and short speeches from the audience. This meeting lasts from 9 until 11 P.M. A third of the audience are Hebrews, or, at any rate, are not natives of the United States; a half are Socialists; for in dealing with working-men I soon learned that the most alert and interested, the most curious to hear and question, are the Socialists. This is true also, I am told, in labor unions, where the Socialists, though they number only ten per cent., perhaps, of the entire membership, are, nevertheless, the most aggressive element.

I have mentioned these meetings because the material for this article is mostly derived from discussions I have heard in them by Socialists and economists.

What is Socialism? What is Christianity? Socialism is an economic theory that proposes to make the state supreme over the individual, rather than to allow the individual to be supreme over the state. Christianity, in the terms of the Baptismal Service in the Book of Common Prayer, is, "To follow the example of our Saviour Christ and to be made like unto Him." Socialism has so many descriptions that its foes feel they have triumphed when they ask, "What is Socialism?" Christianity likewise has so many interpretations that its opponents often choose the worst, or, at any rate, the most characteristic—the individualistic definition—viz., the salvation of the soul through belief in Christ.

Some Socialists can see no relation, no point of comparison between Socialism—an economic theory dealing with the production and distribution of wealth, and Christianity—a religion bent upon the salvation of souls. Nevertheless, Socialism, as its most valuable characteristic, presents a religious motive; it is stirring thousands to new ideals and to self-sacrifice in a purely religious fashion, and is even taking on the methods and habits of religion. On the other hand, Christianity, it must not be for-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gotten, is a doctrine of a Kingdom of Heaven, which is not only an inner, but an outer condition; moreover, Christianity is the child of Judaism, a religion which had more to say about the duties of the rich to the poor than any religion in the world. What is more, Socialism, in its economic position, is changing from a purely mechanical to a more ethical ideal, at the same time that Christianity, in its religious attitude, is changing from a purely spiritual to a more economic outlook.

The following quotations appeared in a recent letter to the "New York Times." I have not verified them, but I use them because they illustrate the feeling of masses of uneducated Socialists I have listened to and represent the older but prevailing attitude:

"Marx said: 'Religion is a fantastic degradation of human nature.'"

"Liebknecht, the grand old man of Socialism, said: 'Socialism must conquer the stupidity of the masses in so far as this stupidity reveals itself in religious forms and dogmas.'"

"And Bebel, the present great world leader of Socialism, says: 'We wish in politics the republic, in economy Socialism, and in religion atheism.'"

Socialism inherited atheism from Marx and Lassalle. These pioneers did not derive it from their economic position, but from Feuerbach and his Hegelianism. Their followers, however, have accepted their philosophical as well as their political views. The practical effect of Socialistic atheism is to deny immortality, to concentrate attention upon this life and to intensify confidence in material well-being. In our Sunday-night meetings, after an eloquent individualist had held forth about the soul, a Socialist would stand up and say: "I know nothing about the soul. Where is it? I only know that I have a stomach and that it is empty."

Socialism denies to religion any economic influences. The Pope, for instance, has nothing to fear, theoretically, from Socialists who will not for a moment admit that Catholicism has retarded the development of any country in Europe; not because they have studied the facts, but because they claim, as a general principle, that history is interpreted economically; that moral and religious forces have had nothing to do with the growth or decline of states.

Behind this denial of influence to religion is the denial of important constructive power to ideas. Socialism has not wished

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to work by means of the slow influence of ideas, but by means of various compulsions—military, legislative, etc. Nevertheless, their propaganda is an appeal to reason and conscience.

Socialism asserts that morality is the offspring of society. The good individual is the product of a good society; a good society is not the product of good individuals. Moreover, that moral codes are the handiwork of the dominant class, which codifies and gives authority to what will preserve its order.

Socialism maintains that the Church is hypocritical, because it received the command, "Love your neighbor as yourself," but supports, nevertheless, an industrial system under which it is impossible to love your neighbor as yourself—whose maxim, in fact, is the old pagan *caveat emptor*—let the buyer take heed.

Socialism considers the doctrine of the forgiveness of sin to be the source of much industrial and private injustice, because it frees the wrong-doer from the sense of responsibility. Until the priestly power of absolution is destroyed, tyranny will flourish.

Socialism calls pietism and passivity (two traits of Christianity) injurious to civilization, because progress has been attained not by meekness, but by struggle.

Socialism hates the religious way of dealing with poverty—that is, by charity and philanthropy—because these are remedial and based upon a voluntary spirit. Socialism would legislate poverty out of existence and would have what are now sporadic acts of kindness made compulsory usages. In short, Socialism considers religion a rubbish-heap of arbitrary laws and gross superstitions used as a prop to social injustice.

SOME ETHICAL MISTAKES OF SOCIALISM.

These attitudes of unfriendliness to religion are scientifically mistaken or are ethically weak. Socialism regards religion in an old-fashioned way as an artifice of priests and powerful castes, and not in the new-fashioned way as a biological product—created and perpetuated because it was of use, changing and reshaping itself in response to criticism and increased knowledge.

It was a mistake for Socialism to take on atheism, which has no logical connection with its economic position, simply because Marx and Lassalle were atheists. Socialists declaim against mixing up religion with economics. Why, then, mix up irreligion with economics?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Socialism is a new form of pity—the self-pity of "the proletariat" and the world-pity of the fortunate. Now world-pity is a Promethean and magnanimous trait, but self-pity a pigmy and rather contemptible exhibition. Socialists in America will not win the respect of the older blood of the country until they stop calling themselves "the proletariat" and "children of the abyss." There is a beggar whine in these epithets thoroughly un-American. A people which has subdued a continent is not quick to sympathize with a cult that accuses circumstances and upbraids fortune. In this respect Americans are Stoics. "The worst state of man," said Epictetus, "is to accuse external things; better than that is to accuse a man's self and best to accuse neither."

Furthermore, it is an ethical mistake to suppose that all the torments of the soul are to vanish before personal prosperity. There is no such thing as a noble peace and rest in terms of considerate circumstances, which graciously supplies what we desire; but there is peace in terms of a spiritual attitude which can look on all things with serenity.

Nor can the Socialist state make its members happy in spite of themselves. The virtue required for carrying on a co-operative commonwealth will not be generated by the mere running of the machinery. Honesty, temperance, unselfishness cannot be born, willy-nilly, out of a new industrial system.

Nor will an assured and sufficient livelihood obliterate selfish ambition and greed. No improvement in material conditions is going to make saints out of sinners. Boost Socialists to opulence and they would merely repeat the experiences of the well-to-do of to-day; they would meet temptation and often succumb; they would have children and hand down to some of them evil traits. Human progress is made by steps, not by leaps and bounds. This law will not be changed by merely rearranging the handicaps.

A great believer in democracy, James Russell Lowell, could say:

> "Men prate
> Of all heads to an equal grade cashiered,
> On level with the dullest, and expect
> (Sick of no worse distemper than themselves)
> A wondrous cure-all in equality;
> They reason that To-morrow must be wise
> Because To-day was not, nor Yesterday,
> As if good days were shapen of themselves,
> *Not of the very life blood of men's souls.*"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Considering the methods of Socialism, its confidence in brute force, in mechanical laws, Nietzsche was not far wrong when he wrote: "Socialism is not a problem of right, but of power—no violent redistribution, but a slow, gradual reformation and regeneration of the mind are needed; the sense of justice must be increased everywhere, whilst that of violence must be weakened."

Socialism has no place for sorrow or suffering. It expects general well-being to do away with suffering. This is too naïve. Have we nothing but bodies? And are our bodies to be pain-proof under Socialism? Is there no pleasure of the heart to be hoped for or regretted? Is there no aspiration of the spirit to be fostered or mourned?

Socialism in its teaching exalts love. But does it know of some new kind of love that is exempt from suffering? Neither is it romantic love alone, the love of a Werther that suffers or suffers most deeply; the love of humanity—the Christ-love of a Mazzini suffers most profoundly of all. In fact, the more the Socialist's brotherly love is developed the greater will be his capacity for suffering. This elimination of suffering as a practical and as a moral factor in a well-fed world contradicts the experience of the body and the soul.

"Be the world great or small," says Anatole France, "what matter is that to mankind? It is always great enough, provided it gives us a stage for suffering or for love. To suffer and to love—these are the twin sources of inexhaustible beauty. Suffering and pain; how divine it is, how misunderstood. To it we owe all the good in us, all that makes life worth living; to it we owe pity and courage and all the virtues. The earth is but a grain of sand in a barren infinity of worlds. Yet, if it is only on earth creation suffers, it is greater than all the rest of the universe put together."

The most serious question put to Socialists is a moral question. They must exert themselves in a co-operative commonwealth as much as they do in a competitive state or more, but spontaneously and with good-will, as from either love or duty. This is the highest ethical ideal of conduct.

A co-operative commonwealth, if all are to have an abundance, must be asked to produce as much per capita as now. The present waste in strikes, in lockouts and in various forms of industrial conflict, besides the waste of vanity, dissipation and luxury, would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

then be required for those who now are below the margin of consumption—a very appreciable percentage of the population.

But the co-operative state can never do this until its citizens have a high sense of moral responsibility and altruism. Some men work to-day as hard for humanity, science or art as they could possibly work for purely selfish ends. This kind of enthusiasm for work would have to extend to all industrial branches. Such moral ardor is a spiritual as well as an economic necessity by which, through labor, men can develop the possibilities of their souls. Is Socialism equal to it?

Christianity is now so largely supported and interpreted by the propertied classes that it fears a doctrine that criticises private property or seems to threaten it.

The heterodoxy most dangerous, at present, to a clergyman's status in the Church is not doctrinal, but industrial. There is a good deal of truth in what Karl Marx said in the preface of the first edition of "Capital."

"The English Established Church will more readily pardon an attack on thirty-eight of its thirty-nine Articles than on one-thirty-ninth of its income. Nowadays atheism is *culpa levis*, as compared with criticism of existing property relations."

Christianity takes hold of the opposite end of the stick from Socialism; it would renovate society by first renovating the individual. Christianity considers the eternal welfare of the soul above the present well-being of the body. Christianity regards the hardships of life as providentially sent to school the soul.

Christianity fails to perceive that ethical laws have not been produced out of the needs of the individual as an individual, but out of social relationships.

"Morals and conscience," says Lydston, in his "Diseases of Society," "have developed from the social necessities of the human race and are not natural attributes."

Christianity, therefore, is indebted to the very social environment it has tended (in its extreme care for the individual) to neglect.

Christianity makes a mistake in being still so other-worldly; in clinging to dogmatic belief as the path to spiritual safety; in encouraging intense individualism without a sufficient social balance; in allowing itself to be so largely tied to the stability of the comfortable classes; in not admitting the fundamental im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portance of the bread-and-butter problem and in not acknowledging that heredity and environment (outer, not inner conditions) have spiritual influence.

Socialism criticises Christianity for not promoting the general welfare; in not securing a larger share of the world's wealth for the working-man. Christianity retorts that property is not its field and echoes Jesus's words, "Who made me a judge or a divider over you?" Socialists assert that there is food and clothing enough in the world for all—that none should suffer want; and that until the problem of waste and want is settled all other problems are insignificant. Christianity replies that the Socialist thinks only of the body and of this world, and that he neglects the soul and the world to come and quotes its Master: "A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of things which he possesseth." Both the Socialist and Christian hold extreme positions. The Socialist cannot ask that all other effort ceases until everybody has enough to eat. Life is not such a single-track road as that. Christianity is equally obtuse when it will not admit that the bread-and-butter problem is at the basis of civilization. Christianity is too individualistic; it leaves the personal fortunes of men and women too much to the strength of their inner nature; it does not utilize, in their behalf, the boundless power of social co-operation.

SOCIALISM AND CHRISTIANITY NEED EACH OTHER.

Socialism is a new religious movement, a new expression of justice, of fraternity and real democracy. Its methods are political, its ends economic; but its spirit (which is its greatest gift to our time) ought to live in spite of its methods and beyond its goal. Its most advanced advocates are no longer basing their arguments upon Marxian economies, but upon the plea of justice, brotherhood and of better opportunities for higher human development.

Its political programme, so far as it aims at material advantages, might easily be captured any day by either of our political parties, but its spirit of co-operation and of higher justice is needed and must persist.

Socialism uses religious propaganda; its Sunday-schools are increasing in Europe and America. In the British Sunday-schools the following are some of the texts taught:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The New World, its Foundations to be Justice; Love to be the Spirit of its inhabitants."

"All things pass away, but Love abideth forever."

"He who owns the things men must have, owns the men who have them."

"That which is not in the interest of the whole swarm is not in the interest of a single bee."

There is nothing to be alarmed at in this; it is as old as Aristotle and St. Paul. "The end of the state and the individual," said Aristotle, "are the same." "Now abideth faith, hope and love," said St. Paul, "but the greatest of these is love."

Socialism demands practically a transformation of human nature, for it must depend upon honest and self-controlled men when its civilization is in the hands of Government employees. Consequently, it demands clean politics, which cannot be secured merely by better political machinery, but by better men. These Christianity, if true to itself, can produce.

Socialism must correct not only the greed of overpaid rich, but the materialism of underpaid poor; both are unlovely. For after material well-being is secured the moral and spiritual problems of human nature still remain unsolved.

Many Socialists ignorantly call themselves such when they only demand reform. The most popular subjects discussed before our Sunday night and Tuesday night groups were: The Teaching of Market-Gardening and Farming to School Children; The Means of Stopping the Spread of Tuberculosis. The enthusiasm of working-men over these subjects, disclosed to me the fact that these audiences were unfamiliar with definite lines of attempted social improvement, but could appreciate the advantage of reforms, as contrasted with revolutionary legislation, when such reforms were pointed out and explained.

Socialism is not a new idea, but a rate of speed; consequently, what is wanted is intelligence to hasten progress rather than revolution to destroy present gains. Highroads, city water, public schools, courts, etc., are all socialistic, and the present will surely enlarge the list of state-controlled institutions.

Socialists have a tendency toward a new Puritanism. They are largely vegetarians and total abstainers from alcohol.

Socialism needs religion's pursuit of moral ideals by which alone happiness can be secured; otherwise Socialism, in despair at the emptiness of its attainment, is in danger of committing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suicide in its hour of victory. The words of the celebrated psychologist, Dr. Paul Dubois, may well be a warning:

". . . Let us beware of placing all our happiness on cards liable to be shuffled at any moment by others' hands or blown away by the least wind. It is this point of view that gives me only a very moderate confidence in the benefits of civilization, so long as it only brings us material advantage, greater comfort in our homes, better food and more cheerfulness of spirit, however noble they may be. Happiness is not there; it dwells in the deepest part of us, in our inmost ego; it can only have its existence in the most complete of our ideal aspirations, in the worship of the True, the Beautiful and the Good."

Socialism needs patience and charity. Two hours were required in one of our Sunday-night meetings for the Commissioner of Charities to convince the Socialists present of the good faith of a bill, introduced in the Legislature of New York, which proposed to create a labor colony for vagrants. In the end it turned out that the bill had been drafted by leading Socialists.

The objection the Socialist makes to the individual's religious isolation is well taken: "Religion is a relationship to God; a cleanly and high ordering of the soul," says the individualist. "Yes," says the Socialist, "but the relationship to God must include relationship to men; and how can your relationship to them be profound if you will not actively help them? Your own Bible should reprove you: "Whoso hath this world's goods and seeth his brother have need and shutteth up his compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" "If a man say, I love God and hateth his brother he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?"

The poor man cannot understand a religion that is an assent to propositions and is satisfied to hold itself aloof from life—a religion that is a mental state or an emotion and pays no attention to the clamor of empty stomachs.

We shall always have, perforce, vicissitudes enough to whet our spiritual appetites for moral combat. We need not manufacture hardships, as ascetics have done, nor maintain them as modern mystics are inclined to do. Indeed, when we are willing to allow hardships to remain in the world, particularly the hardships of others, we are about as good Christians as Artemus Ward was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a patriot during the Civil War. He said that he was willing to sacrifice all his wife's relations upon the altar of his country.

THE SOLUTION.

Neither individualism nor Socialism, as a solitary principle, governs progress, but rather a combination of the two. Until a man has made something of himself—is a healthy, sane and energetic individual—he is a burden to society; until society is organic and protects the individual it is not discharging its function.

The point at issue between individualists and Socialists is capable of solution—a solution that does not demand the surrender of either side. The future is not to see a purely individualistic or a purely Socialistic order, but one in which both principles are realized.

In biology the individual life and individual efficiency appear first, then a collectivism for the sake of a higher individuality. The individual, as an individual, must be good for something before he can be good enough for collective use; but by his collective relationships becomes of still further importance.

In psychology we discover that there are other influences affecting personality besides that which originates in the mind and is self-directed; there are exterior influences—viz., heredity and environment. The Christian individualist holds that the will is the great instrument of regeneration; the atheistic Socialist holds that environment is the agent of improvement. But will, according to its most modern definition (cf. Professor James), is a form of suggestion; it is a holding of an ideal before the mind until action follows. Environment also is a form of suggestion.

The depths of human consciousness are the product of heredity, environment, education, will—not of one, but of all. If, then, nature works with all these agents, have we a right to demand that our fellows work with only one? Man will always continue to be the child of many parents. Cromwell did not know how much his iron will borrowed from his inheritance, environment and education.

Socialism is continually declaiming against the superior individual, against genius and its masteries, but in the same breath begs the genius to arise and emancipate the wage slave. If Socialism ever wins it will be by the aid of what it despises—genius and religion. The first it needs to perfect the organization

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of industry; the second it needs to change the human heart and equip mankind with the virtues required by its new organization.

The Christian Socialist is laughed at and repudiated as being neither a Christian nor a Socialist. He is too Socialistic for capitalistic Churchmen and too individualistic for "the proletariat." The Christian Socialist is the man in the middle of the road in spiritual and industrial progress. He is the Christian who is not purely an individualist. He is a Socialist who believes in moral idealism. This is a perfectly clear and valuable distinction.

On the Continent Christian Socialism is a movement largely organized and directed by the Roman Catholic Church to counteract the effect of Marxian Socialism. Continental Christian Socialism is also, I believe, anti-Semitic. Both these considerations render it repugnant to the American Socialists, who, being so often of non-British races, do not know much about Charles Kingsley and Maurice, and the manly advocacy of working-men's projects that characterized the founders of English Christian Socialism. The test of modern civilization will be its willingness to face the problem of co-operation and to attempt a purer democracy. What does Whittier's "Barefoot Boy" know about classes?

But if the farmer's boy, when a successful man of business, separates himself from the rank and file; if he forms alliance by marriage with European aristocracy; if he favors the social system and pleasures of the leisure class of Europe, he is playing into the hands of Socialism. He is creating classes in a democracy, and so is furnishing the factors for that "class struggle" which Karl Marx pronounces the evolutionary road to Socialism.

The separation of heads of great corporations from their workmen, by the necessity that keeps one in a financial centre and the other in an industrial centre, suited to their special product; the separation in sympathy between capital and labor, as labor has become more and more foreign—all these causes have produced in America to-day what we denied a quarter of a century ago existed, namely, classes.

Success, too, separates the fortunate from the unfortunate. Not only is there a social change in the status of the man who has arrived, but there is little sympathy felt by him for the man who is left behind. Success and humility rarely go together.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"*Qu'il est difficile, messieurs, d'être victorieux et d'être humble tout ensemble!*" cried the French orator, Fléchier, in his eulogy on Marshal Turenne. Our victorious captains of industry are not often enough Turennes,—at once successful and humble.

Under the circumstances of an increasing class separation in the United States, anything that can counterbalance undemocratic influences should be looked upon with favor. The Church to-day can help stem this undemocratic tide and can be of great social, industrial and political usefulness.

The permanent utility of the institution known as the Church is grounded in its power to affect association—to bring classes together. No other institution, except the state, gives one so large and permanent a tie with his fellows. The family is small and shifts. School and college meet the needs of only a part of our lives. Organizations for special objects, even great ends, are naturally one-sided and change complexion with success or failure, as can be seen in labor unions and political parties.

The Church represents a permanent interest from the cradle to the grave—a universal interest; an organization of ideals which all can share and aspire to; an association of all classes in a common hope.

The best thing about the Sunday-night meetings at the Church of the Ascension—upon which the views expressed in this article are based—is that they have done just the thing the Church can and should do; they have brought extremes together—the rich and poor, the educated and uneducated. When thrown together the good in each is mutually appreciated. The sincerity of the capitalist and the honesty of the radical working-man have been made apparent. While no attempt to make proselytes was for a moment contemplated or permitted, yet, to my surprise, a large number of persons, who supposed themselves hostile to religion, experienced in the course of these meetings almost an emotional conversion to a more peaceful and spiritual view.

The power of popular government is an ethical power. The masses cannot reason as well as a selected, trained aristocracy; but they reduce political problems to ethical terms and solve them by the use of a healthy conscience. The Church to-day, like the prophet of old, should be the voice of conscience and should keep a democracy true to its moral ideals.

PERCY STICKNEY GRANT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME IMPEDIMENTS TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

BY MRS. GILBERT E. JONES, FOUNDER OF THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE CIVIC EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

THERE is little doubt that we are indulging in a twentieth-century "feminist" movement. It has been tried in the past and history repeats itself. Women have made themselves felt in the destiny of nations before now, and it will be interesting and instructive to see if the woman's political efforts of to-day will be effectual and whether the results will be permanent.

The plea of the Suffragists is for the equality of the sexes. They assume, as a rule, that women have been browbeaten and downtrodden; that they are now awakening; and if we are willing to admit the equality of the sexes, that they should stand on an equal footing in the pursuit of industry and in the control of the Government which they must obey. The Anti-Suffragists grant the equality of the sexes. Men are no better than women, and science assures us that they are no more intelligent. But the "Anti" insists that the *difference* between the sexes shall not be ignored. Consequently, all suffrage arguments may be reduced to the proposition of "*equality*"; all Anti-Suffrage arguments to that of "*differentiation.*"

The "Woman-Suffrage" agitation has been in active operation since 1848. In these sixty years many more complex issues have been before the public and have been more generally and keenly felt. Slavery has been abolished, the Spanish war has been fought, the Silver problem has been settled, but we still have the Woman-Suffrage question with us, after sixty years of dispute from Massachusetts to California. Of late the efforts of the Suffragists have been more pronounced, but their failures have increased proportionately. In the last twelve years the Legislatures of the various States have turned

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

down Suffrage proposals on an average of once in every twenty-seven days. Why is it that the American public cannot be aroused? Such a simple issue, such simple arguments should have caught the popular imagination long ago. Public opinion has been at white-heat many times in this interval. Take the Civil War, for instance: the nation was determined to give the negro political equality; it was willing to go through a long and bloody war, and to give the lives of 500,000 men to have it done. The Suffragists have been telling us, ever since the days of Lincoln, that we are denying our mothers, sisters, wives and daughters a privilege to which they have as much right as the negro. Why is it that they have not set the country aflame, from one end to the other, with this argument? If they are right the men of this country are not only unfair, but tyrannical, and public opinion, on which our Government depends, has been countenancing manifest injustice. But even if they are wrong, if women have not the same right to political equality that all men have, why have they not succeeded? One would suppose the claims of the Suffragist stirring enough to rouse the most indifferent, so what have really been the impediments?

The thorough reform in the laws regarding women is unquestionably one impediment; the great respect which the American man has for the American woman is another. In no other country and in no other time has woman been held in such high estimation as she is in the United States of America to-day. She has never before had such complete educational and industrial opportunities offered her. In social, civic, philanthropic centres she is a leader and a power. More women have their individual bank accounts here than in any other part of the world. Woman is granted freedom of religious expression, freedom of speech and pen, freedom from a too conservative home life and parental dependence. Complete emancipation is hers, if she chooses to find it—from a "preacher in the pulpit" to a "full-fledged blacksmith"—from "motherhood" to female "bachelorhood." The American woman of to-day, the average woman, is *further* in advance of the average woman of other countries than is any other class of our population, and all this *without* the ballot. So where is the practical injustice in not granting women the vote?

It is by studying the fundamental principles of our Govern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment that women can find one certain reason why they have been refused the ballot after their sixty years' pleading. The framers of our State Constitutions saw the wisdom of naming "men" only as voters. The Government's right to restrict the citizen and demand certain qualifications has a simple but very direct meaning. Instinct and tradition have made men the protectors of women. This is a natural law. Our Constitution is basically, fundamentally and structurally framed for *safety* and *stability*, "as the safety of the whole is the interest of the whole." What was needed in our earlier days to create confidence in our form of Government is quite as important to-day. Foreign forces, the foreigners within our borders and our own native interests must be considered and cannot be provided for without a stable government. Our Federal and State constitutions amply fulfil this need, and it is significant to find the word "male" inserted, in designating who shall be the voters, for "*men*" are the only citizens who can preserve the safety of our country, our laws and our women. Uncle Sam insists on a full-grown man, of the age of twenty-one years, as the voter, with qualifications as to age, place of residence, etc. Women are certainly within the age and residence qualifications, and they offer morality, intelligence and tax-paying qualifications besides. But the Government does not impose these qualifications on men. Men do not vote *because* they are moral, intelligent or taxpayers *only*.

Then what does the Government require of man that the woman cannot give? The Government asks the man to accept the responsibility of maintaining it, of preserving its very existence. It recognizes that the man forms the *only* basis on which any Government *can* rest. A Government owes its *existence* not to the obedience of its subjects, not to the taxes it receives, but to the fact that the men of the State will come to the support of the State. Even a despotism recognizes this fact in a dim sort of way. But in a democracy this is, and must be, the key-note of the whole structure. The *man* is the rock on which the Government is built, whatever its form. The woman never was and never will be. Giving the man the vote is nothing more than a recognition of this fact. Giving women the vote would be to *deny* it. For it must be remembered that the women in asking for the vote are asking not only for a voice in such public affairs as interest them especially, but for complete sovereign power.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But this is a *contradiction,* for if women vote men must protect that vote, and, to illustrate this truth, a quotation from the "New York Times," April 7th, 1909, will suffice:

"If women had the franchise, and then all the women should vote on one side and the men on the other, and the women should cast the biggest vote, would the men, with their greater physical force, go to arms? And would the women have to give in? That was the question which Mrs. Florence Masterton proposed at the meeting of the 'William Lloyd Garrison Equal Franchise League' at its annual meeting at the home of Miss Florence Guernsey, No. 2 West Eighty-sixth Street. 'Not at all,' said one of the women present; 'majority rules in this country, and if the women were in the majority *then* the Government would come to their assistance and force the acceptance of their vote.'"

How could the Government *force* the acceptance of their vote? By calling on the able-bodied men to *enforce* it. That is the real meaning of Government, and it therefore lies actually only in the hands of men, and our theory of Government should conform to fundamental facts. To guarantee safety and stability to our Union Government cannot indulge in sentiment or emotional methods, as it is a practical business organization. To give women the ballot would be but adding "voice and expression" to our already difficult settling of elections. There are voices enough now. The question is, Should we not have more restriction rather than add to our mixed voting population?

Government has again to be considered. "Votes for women" would also mean that women would hold office, executive, legislative and judicial. Women could be elected to sit in our Legislatures, become Governors, Mayors, judges and jurors. Certainly the nation's legal and judicial authority will not be strengthened by placing women in these official positions, as women are not fitted for such tasks. Government can be likened to a bank and full-grown men are Uncle Sam's capital. If a weaker being is to be intrusted with the guidance of the nation it will have the effect of making silver, instead of gold, our money standard. Both are excellent in their way, but one cannot wholly replace the other. So in the last analysis men must be the basic power and the leaders to guarantee safety to our country, and women cannot relieve them of that burden.

As to the service to the State, given by women in bearing sons, the men work not only to support those sons, but support also their mothers and wives, and that *far* beyond the child-bearing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

age. Motherhood is unquestionably the greatest service to the human race that can possibly be conceived of. The State benefits by it. But Motherhood is neither a State duty nor a State service. The State gives the franchise when it demands service; Motherhood it can neither demand nor deny. Motherhood will still be Motherhood whether the State is a democracy or a despotism, and Motherhood would still continue were all Government abolished. The State depends on it, as it depends on the rain that falls and the sun that shines in the heavens. But it cannot invoke a natural law which must operate as long as the human race survives, as an obligation under which the State shall rest, and therefore part with its privileges.

That tax-paying women should vote seems a claim easily granted if it could prove an advantage to the woman or the State; but it cannot, and an infinite amount of idle sentiment is displayed over this particular subject. Universal Manhood Suffrage is the crowning result in the long evolution of Government. It did not exist in our earlier history. Voters were defined as "Freeholders" who had some moneyed or property qualification. From 1619 there was a gradual and determined struggle to keep property-owners and tax-paying citizens as the only voters or persons having a voice in elections. The constitutional provisions regulating suffrage were in constant dispute, and because of these difficulties fraud and deception were prevalent. It was easy to contract for small pieces of property, "freehold," before election and give them up afterwards with no exchange of money. Taxation and representation of this kind had its many variations and "freeholds" became merely nominal. Reforms were needed and enacted and constitutional amendments were not infrequent. Statesmen, lawyers, citizens and the wise men from the North, South, East and West have been consulted and have conscientiously discussed this question of who should vote, with the result that Universal Manhood Suffrage has been generally adopted. Invariably they have worked away from qualified suffrage and no citizen in the United States votes *because* he pays taxes. Taxpayers are represented in every State in the Union. Legislators are responsible to taxpayers, but there is no reason or precedent for the proposition that legislators must be responsible to *every* taxpayer in order to avoid taxation without representation and it cannot be turned into an *individual* right. Woman Suffragists

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

insist that women should vote because they pay taxes, yet the history of Suffrage proves that this basis for the suffrage is unwise and inexpedient and does not apply in the case of the male citizen. If tax-paying women alone are granted the privilege of the ballot on this plea, will it not create distinct class legislation for rich women? In former times aristocracy prevailed and many voted in proportion to the amount of property they held. The rich man had more voting power than the poor man. This was *undemocratic,* and gradually all moneyed and aristocratic qualifications disappeared.

The Suffragists frequently assert that all women are taxpayers because of our system of *indirect* taxation. In one sense this is true; yet it must be remembered that the vast body of women, including the wage-earning women in this country, are not economically *in*dependent, as they are mainly supported by the men of their families. No woman who is economically *de*pendent on her husband or father or whoever may be supporting her may properly be said to pay taxes. The man supporting her pays them for her or she pays them with his money. So far as this argument is concerned she should therefore be eliminated, and the question should be confined to the woman who pays direct taxes. If tax-paying women are to vote because they pay taxes, may not corporations, minors, non-residents and unnaturalized citizens ask for the same privilege? If it is just to one it must be just to all. Corporations are persons in the eyes of the law and can be indicted, tried and convicted under the criminal laws. Their stockholders are men and women and they pay enormous taxes. Minors' estates are taxed, and neither they nor their guardians, as guardians, have a voice in elections representing them. Unnaturalized citizens often pay taxes a lifetime and can never vote. A non-resident can only vote in the State of his residence, and yet he may pay taxes in several others. There is but one rule for all of these instances, only one reason why they have no vote. The Government cannot exact their allegiance; they cannot be called on to support the State they do not reside in or of which they are not citizens. Women who demand the ballot do not take this into consideration; they ignore these facts.

Women Suffragists say they are "American citizens" and have the "right" to vote as such. This assertion must be corrected, as it does not apply even to the "male" citizen. Citizenship is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a granted right, not a natural one, derived and regulated by each country or State, according to its ideas of Government. Mrs. Rossiter Johnson states in her book, "Women and the Republic" (the best authority on Anti-Suffrage), "Where a majority deemed the preservation of the State depended upon disfranchising a number of voters they would be disfranchised, although they remained citizens." The fallacy of the Suffragist that a voter and a citizen should be one and the same must be disclosed with emphasis, as in this they mislead many women. Chief-Justice Waite, of the United States Supreme Court, decided that citizenship carried with it no voting power or right. The same decision has been handed down by many courts in disposing of test cases. A resident of the District of Columbia has all the privileges of citizenship; but he cannot vote, as that is a State right, and the District of Columbia is not a State. Citizenship does not entitle a man or woman to vote, so the injustice to woman cannot be found here.

There is no one issue of the Woman-Suffrage question that should be so severely condemned as that of promising the wage-earning woman increase of wage when the ballot is within her power. How this can be accomplished has not yet been demonstrated by the Suffragists, and their promises end in *vague* socialistic generalities which delude many hard-working women. It is a well-known fact that the wages of men and women alike depend on demand and supply, an economic, not a political condition. No one has yet shown that the ballot in the hands of the working-man *has raised his* wages. If his wages have increased the causes are generally to be found in the prosperity of the country and in the power of the labor and trades unions. Co-operation has enabled him to obtain higher wages, not the ballot. Woman, as a rule, does not support the family, and her wages are generally of a supplementary character. She undercuts both men's and women's wages, and until she demands and maintains a standard she will never obtain equal pay for equal work. Certainly the ballot cannot help her. Co-operation and organization can.

There is no longer any doubt that women *can* compete with men in some industries. The question is, Does such competition mean *advancement* for women? Medical research finds that where married women are forced to work in factories the birth-rate decreases

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the death-rate of children increases alarmingly. Our sociologists are proving that many kinds of work where women compete with men are invariably injurious to women. The demand for more protective legislation for women workers is constant and increasing. What does this mean? "Emancipation for the women," cry the Suffragists—"another proof that women are equal to men." It is clear that in trying to prove the equality of the sexes they are encouraging one of the greatest evils society has to deal with in this twentieth century. Judge Brewer has said, "Women must be protected from the greed as well as the passion of men." The fact that more women earn their living every year is an evil and not an advance. Strength tests show that the average woman has less than half the physical strength of the average man. When we remember that the care of the home (if she is married) must be carried on besides, we see that the handicap is too great and that the movement is unwise. If she is unmarried the effect on her nervous system, of work in factories and stores, is well known to be injurious and only tends to unfit her for the duties of marriage. If the result is to discourage marriage it is unquestionably an evil.

Imagine that a law could be passed forbidding women from carrying on their professional life. If all women lawyers or doctors, etc., were suddenly withdrawn from their occupations, would there be any serious inconvenience? Or, if most of the wage-earning women in industry were suddenly relieved of their arduous work, would industry stop? No. And the vacancies would soon be filled by men. But imagine for a moment that a law should be passed by which all men should stop working in professions and trades! One cannot calculate the result!

The presumption of the Suffragist is apparent when the foregoing proposition is fully understood. The economic "equality of the sexes" cannot be proven, and the "Antis" challenge their opponents to show how the ballot can be used to bring about the remedy in question for the wage-earning woman.

The Suffragists have created a spirit of unrest among all classes of women. Many Suffrage organizations have become affiliated with and have been endorsed by Socialists. In two successive years either Mr. Hillquit or Mr. Spargo (Socialists) has pleaded the Woman-Suffrage cause before the Senate or Assembly in Albany. Well-known Suffragists have established a sympathetic link with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this revolutionary party, and it will be utterly impossible to separate it in the future development of the movement. Socialism is an enemy to our political and social order, and Women Suffrage *cannot* succeed without its aid. Social and professional leaders of the movement have openly declared themselves Socialists, and their speeches are often revolutionary to a degree. The average American woman, and the Anti-Suffragists in particular, emphatically resent the utterances made at some of the Suffrage meetings. To quote one or two instances will suffice: "The United States Constitution is a dirty piece of brown parchment" —"American women are slaves and drones and drudges." This method of procedure must, in the end, add another impediment to their cause, as both men and women in this country are not in sympathy with such distorted sentiments. "Slaves, drones and drudges" refer generally to married life. Suffragists resent obeying laws made by men and deplore woman's dependence on them. They believe that political enfranchisement will remedy many domestic evils and will tend to make men and women equal. If the sexes are once recognized as being equal and the women are non-dependent the question of maintenance should be altered. The *obligation* of the husband to maintain his wife is of more value to women than all the so-called "equal rights" and "liberties" possibly could be. Women would purchase their freedom dearly if they surrendered this social and legal position, as man now *must* support his wife and also pay her debts even if she is rich and the husband is poor. The law protects the woman in property, conjugal and parental rights. Woman's dependence on the husband is her safeguard, the rock on which her ease and security rest. Self-support is more difficult for a woman than it is for a man by virtue of her physical inequality. Rich and poor men will always be able to secure wives of their own rank and generally on their own terms. If the man is able to sustain the family and provide shelter, food and clothing for the home the average woman will gladly consent to be a co-worker in a lesser or greater degree. Political emancipation on the woman's part will not alter so practical and every-day a condition, and when it does our middle classes will be more unfortunate than they are.

The four Woman-Suffrage States, Utah, Wyoming, Idaho and Colorado, do not give an interesting object-lesson of how Suffrage can be effective. Suffragists have "Suffrage" testimony

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that is encouraging and convincing to the many credulous uninvestigating converts. Anti-Suffragists have ample evidence to prove Woman Suffrage in these States a dismal failure. The late General Palmer pronounced Woman Suffrage a "failure" in Colorado just before his death; yet no one in that State had the welfare of its citizens so dear at heart as that magnificent old General.

The much-discussed Judge Lindsey, of the Juvenile Courts of Denver, expressed his views in an interview presented in the "New York Times," February 7th, 1909:

"I can't say that the women's vote has helped things much in Colorado. Both the political parties of the State have been, and still are, under absolute domination of the public-service corporations. Now this is a point that I want you to make clear: I have found that women in politics are *no* better and no worse than men. Don't forget that when a question narrows itself down to the bread-line, to selfish interests, both sexes follow the same line of action—they look out for No. 1. If a woman wants to get a political job she will stand for iniquity; if she's afraid of losing her job she'll do the same thing."

The thoroughly unprejudiced opinion is that "Woman Suffrage" has proved to be utterly "futile." Not bad and not good, or rather, not worth while. It has not brought about one single benefit that cannot be found in other States where women do not vote. Certainly no State can boast of good, safe political conditions when it must call out a *stalwart, forcible reserve* of "women and the kids" to elect *one* good man to office. New York State had a greater victory in electing Charles Evans Hughes as Governor, and the men of the State alone were needed to accomplish the fact.

In the States where Woman Suffrage is in practice divorce laws are singularly lax, and men and women from other States flock there to take advantage of them. In strong contrast to this state of affairs, it is well known that the Anti-Suffragists demand universal divorce laws. Equality that women ask for and further emancipation of women will lessen the chances of marriage, and divorce will soon be created at will. Nearly a million divorces have been granted in the United States during the last twenty years; that is 1,000 every week or an average of 140 every day, yet women ask for more liberty.

Throughout women have shown themselves singularly credulous. Suffrage leaders have but to make a statement and it is accepted at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

once. Investigation, on the part of the women, is very rare. For this reason the "National League for the Civic Education of Women" has been organized. Its purpose is to give women of the country the best possible means of obtaining information bearing on their rights, responsibilities and economic position in the community. At present it is investigating the Woman-Suffrage question. Civic education can hardly be complete unless the use of the ballot is understood by both men and women. If women had studied the fundamental principles of Government, Woman Suffrage could not have gained the headway that it has and many of them would very clearly see how the movement is strongly allied with Socialism. Hundreds of members of the League have done so, and in consequence feel the importance of sustaining our present form of Government and are now known as "Governmentalists." This is prompted by their spirit of patriotism, their faith in intrusting Government to the men and a consistent adherence to our true American and Democratic principles.

The tendency to ally with Socialism, the emptiness of the promises to the wage-earner, the groundlessness of the cry, "Taxation without representation is tyranny," the fundamental truth that Government is the work of the man because it depends on him alone for its very existence, the failure of Suffrage in the four Suffrage States; these are some of the impediments in the way of the Woman Suffragists. But the most important of all lies in the long-continued indifference of the great mass of the people. It cannot be said that they do not understand the movement or that they have not heard of it; nor can it be said that there is nothing in it to appeal to the popular imagination. On the contrary, few propositions, not even Socialism, afford the stump-speaker such excellent material for rousing his hearers. It can hardly be believed that this indifference is due to the fact that the public has found the fallacies in the Suffrage arguments. The Suffragists believe that this negative attitude is due to long-standing prejudice. The last sixty years have seen every *important* legal restriction on women removed in New York State and in many of the other States of the Union. The same legislators at Albany that have removed property-holding restrictions from married women granted them full contractual and conjugal rights; in short, placed them on a legal equality with men, have turned a deaf ear to the annual demand for political equality.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The public opinion of the State has looked with approval on these legislative reforms and has sanctioned woman's demand for equal opportunity in every detail of life. Yet this same public opinion stands neutral. This is not prejudice. The most striking arguments fail to rouse and we have simply a complete lack of interest, but next to no opposition. The active Anti-Suffragists are a mere handful and could not for one moment withstand the issue if public opinion were really back of it. Is it not absurd to say that the movement has been downed for sixty years by prejudice against women when everything else they could possibly ask for has been granted them unreservedly, and when all the efforts of the Suffragists during that time have not even aroused resistance except spasmodically?

No one can deny the equality of the sexes, but there is still a chasm between them, in spite of the fact that the heights on either side are equally majestic. This chasm has never been adequately explored, but it will not for that reason do to tell us that it does not exist. It is by instinct rather than by reason that the great American public has remained passive on this subject. The American man feels strongly that he is, and must always be, the protector of his "women folk." He does not ask why; he knows that it is true. He also feels dimly that the demand of women for the ballot "to protect themselves" is inconsistent with his protectorate. He is willing to give women everything they ask. But if he is going to protect women he *will not* give them the "ruling power." He cannot, therefore, be roused to enthusiasm on the subject. The women feel this as strongly as the men and that is why they cannot be roused. That this attitude is unreasoning must be to a great extent admitted; that it is prejudiced must be strongly denied. It is an unstudied acknowledgment of the distinction between the sexes. If it is to be removed, then there will go with it much of the best that there is in men and women. When men come to feel that they are no longer the protectors of their wives, daughters, mothers and sisters, and when the women look to the ballot for their protection rather than to their husbands, sons and fathers, then Woman Suffrage will be a necessity and public opinion will be clamoring for it. But till this is true the subject will be one to which the American people will remain indifferent.

MRS. GILBERT E. JONES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STUDENT ACTIVITIES.

BY THEODORE STANTON.

In 1906 and during the summer school of 1907, I spent altogether some four months at Cornell University, residing with a body of undergraduates in their house on the Campus. By this means I became pretty well acquainted with student life as it exists to-day at Ithaca and at some of the other leading universities, for I was careful to question students of those institutions who came our way either on short visits or as candidates for advanced degrees.

One evening we had at dinner at the upper-class table, a graduate of two years before, a young man in the wholesale coal business, if I remember rightly, in one of the large New York towns. During the post-prandial conversation he asked the Seniors and Juniors sitting around him to try and guess what part of his work in Ithaca did him the most good when he got out into active life. One thought it might be his study of the modern languages, another asked if it were not his political-economy lectures, while a third remarked that it might be his English. "No," answered he, when the whole table had given up the conundrum, "it was the training I got as manager of the baseball nine. Nothing I have done so far in the actual business world has put such a strain on me as did those tours with the nine, and never have I felt so much responsibility as during the season when I filled that undergraduate position."

I have since wished that President Eliot had been at that dinner-table and had heard that statement. He might then have been willing to admit that some good thing can come out of Nazareth and agree with that other former ruler, Mr. Roosevelt, that the beginning and the end, especially the end, of college sports is not on some University "Field."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The fact is that I, like almost all the alumni of our universities, had never seen all that is really good in these Student Activities, with all their curious and valuable ramifications, until I spent these few months with my undergraduate friends. It is quite true that those activities were generally more talked about than university studies; or at least they were, to use a racing phrase, neck and neck. "Well, I think I have sufficient honors now and will stop here," I heard a Sophomore say one day, and I naturally inferred, especially as the speaker was perhaps the most intellectual of "the crowd," that he meant scholarship success of some kind. But I soon found that I was mistaken. He was the assistant editor of one of the undergraduate publications, was manager of a "minor sport," or something of that sort, and had just been elected an officer of his class. These were the "honors" he had in mind.

I learned, too, that many of the professors at Cornell as elsewhere are almost as interested in some of these Student Activities as they are in their teaching duties. Thus, during a whole week I remarked that the Junior who sat next to me at table was continually referring in covert terms to his fears and worries about some suspended calamity. So I immediately jumped to the conclusion that he was going to be "busted out of the university," to use a term more forcible and picturesque than elegant which prevails on "The Hill" at Cornell. But in the end I discovered that what was rendering this young man's life miserable was the risk he ran, on account of some university shortcoming, of losing his position as assistant manager of the football team, and what I thought one of the most curious features of the case was the fact that his stoutest champions before the faculty committee were two professors holding high positions in the teaching body.

In fact, this close union of members of the faculty with the sports and many of the other activities in our American universities is one of the most notable and one of the best differences between the undergraduate life of the present and a generation ago. Goldwin Smith attending a rowing contest at "the corner of the lake" was an event in my college days back in the seventies. But now the professors present at Ithaca football matches are "too numerous to mention." The same thing is true of all our institutions, small and great, for higher education. I well remember, for instance, how the late President Potter used fre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quently to lead in the applause at a Hobart College baseball game, especially if the good play were made by the Geneva nine.

Let us now examine a little more closely what are these Student Activities and what is the spirit that governs them. For this purpose I have addressed myself to some of the representative undergraduates themselves of different institutions, preferring not to trust wholly to my own observation in this delicate and rather complex matter. I am especially indebted to Mr. Edmund Eitel, Cornell '07, who was editor-in-chief of the "Cornell Daily Sun" during his Senior year and who is now pursuing post-graduate studies at Harvard, to Mr. George Hurley, a recent graduate of Brown University and now at Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar, and to Mr. B. B. Snowden, who was recently, if he be not still, an undergraduate at Williams College. Mr. Eitel writes:

"The phrase 'Student Activities' can best be understood if you think of the four undergraduate years as a miniature life, for then you have your beginners, the Freshmen, who are at the bottom of the ladder, and your venerables, the Seniors, who are the leaders and the counsellors. And just as in the world outside men honor highest those who have done the most for their community or country, so inside the college the students honor those highest who have done the most in their interest. The undergraduate who wins several points for his university in a track meet has done, it is held, as much for the good name and renown of his little community as the general who wins on the battle-field a victory for his country. The students praise and encourage their hero after the same fashion as national patriots praise theirs. It is amusing, but not entirely absurd, to draw a parallel between the nation's army and navy with the accompanying generals, admirals, military experts and financiers, and the college's elevens, nines, crews, etc., with their captains, commodores, coaches and managers. Again, just as there is the national press, so there is the college press in all the forms that the outside world furnishes models of—the daily, the weekly, the comic paper, the monthly, etc. If you turn to politics you will find that the same comparison holds good. It is curious to notice that the 'campaign of purity' which swept over parts of the United States in the autumn of 1906 had its repercussion in 'class politics.' Cornell and other universities had their reforms. The boyish mind, with its vivid imagination, readily lights on these points of similarity, and the resemblance enhances his own affairs and gives them a fuller meaning and importance. The college man frequently says: 'If high principles cannot prevail in our little community, what kind of men will we make when we get outside?' This is one of the reasons why a student is so earnest and serious about his 'college activities.' In a word, whatever the line of activity, it is governed by the same laws that regulate the world's work. Men honor those who serve them best, especially when the deed is con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spicuous and the usefulness of the service prominent. Hence the wonderful and extensive development of undergraduate activities is largely explained by the encouragement given to beginners by those who have gone before; they are eager to win the laurels which they see their elders wearing."

Perhaps the most remarkable example of Student Activities to be found in the whole American university system is that offered by the "Cornell Daily Sun," whose organization is here described somewhat in detail, thanks to Mr. Eitel and to Mr. Lewis Henry, '09, the present editor-in-chief.

"The necessity of producing every day, without fail, an eight-page paper," writes Mr. Eitel, "*forces* us into an excellent system, and the fact that the paper is incorporated in accordance with the laws of the State of New York gives the concern certain serious elements, such as a board of directors, an inviolable constitution and by-laws, etc., which render the "Sun" *sui generis,* perhaps, in college journalism."

These young men take great pride in the excellence of their organization. The board is composed of ten students—an editor-in-chief, a business manager and an assistant business manager, two Seniors who edit, two Juniors who edit, a managing editor and two Sophomore reporters. The bulk of all the work, both news-gathering and business, is done by "competitors," younger students who are trying to get on the board. They are paid nothing. Some twenty-five Freshmen compete each fall and about as many more in the spring. But one student is selected from each competition, and the two become the new members of the editorial staff. Another reporter is chosen in the fall of the Sophomore year. The assistant business manager is elected after he has competed from Easter in his Freshman year to Easter in his Sophomore year. The two last students do not become full members of the board, therefore, until the new board is organized, which occurs at Easter. The managing editor is chosen from the three reporters—the two who are on the board and the successful competitor of the Sophomore class. "He is judged," says Mr. Eitel, "on ability in editing, reporting, original ideas, editorials and on personality." The "Sun" competitions are recognized as the fairest in the university. "They have to be so, for the ability of the board depends on the honesty of the competitions and the success of the competitions depends on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

squareness with which they are conducted." This statement is admirable and speaks volumes for the high moral force which so permeates the American undergraduate body and so largely helps to render our universities, it has always seemed to me, one of the finest products of our civilization.

The business side of the Cornell "Sun" is very notable. A system of monthly audits by a professional accountant, hired by the board, insures competent bookkeeping and honesty. "The business manager has a mass of work to perform, the filling of a large advertising space, the dictation of numerous letters, seeing that the papers are properly delivered and the supervision of the competitors. He generally 'signs up' the bulk of the advertising during the spring and summer preceding his Senior year. To convince the town merchants, who have been assailed by similar managers and numerous solicitors for other college publications for the past decade and more, and to obtain a contract when the advertiser often doubts the value of it, is a feat which requires much real ability and is the more praiseworthy when it is borne in mind that this is the first step in the business world taken by the young manager. But all those who have ever passed through this mill agree that it is one of the rare valuable experiences of college life."

This is what Mr. Eitel has to say about the editorial side of the "Sun": "The board is highly systematized. It took two weeks before the editors of the eight-page daily, when it was first introduced, could get it out in time for delivery at 7 A.M., and even then any little accident would sometimes cause a delay in the issue. But to-day prompt delivery and accuracy are taken as a matter of course at Cornell." The editorial work begins in the morning when the managing editor, who has charge of the college news matter, writes the assignments for the regular reporters in a book kept at a convenient place on the campus. At seven o'clock in the evening the news editor comes into the office and reports to the editor-in-chief or inserts his name on a time-stamped card kept in the former's desk. There is a fine for lateness, which moves on a sliding scale. The news editor finds on his desk a list of all the important items. This is furnished by the managing editor. The former now begins reading copy, writing head-lines and immediately starts sending matter to the compositors. Freshmen competitors, transformed for the nonce

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into a sort of printer's devil, carry copy to the printing-office, answer the telephone and write out in its first form the bulk of the news matter. But all that they pen does not get in. What is printed, however, is given credit for in inches. "No excuse is accepted for mistakes, even though Dr. Schurman himself might have misinformed the unfortunate tyro." A fine of so many inches of credit is deducted from his account. But this punishment is not limited to the beginners. The news editor is fined, when necessary, up to two dollars. While the writing of the editorials is done almost exclusively by the editor-in-chief, his work consists of much more than the filling up of this column. If he is a young man of parts he will spend much more time in discussing and getting light on all student movements and undergraduate affairs than in mere writing. Then he has a great deal to attend to in seeing that every one is doing his proper work and in consulting with those below him. "In a word, he is the actual head of the concern. The subject is on his mind all day long, and when he leaves the office at midnight or perhaps at one o'clock in the morning the worry is not ended, for he trembles at what may happen to the telegraph service during the hours immediately following." The telegraphic news sent up from New York by a high-salaried journalist, who has taken an interest in the enterprise and has consented to do the work at a very reasonable price, reaches the printer between two and three in the morning of publication. "Unfortunately the lateness of the hour prevents us from assigning the editing of this copy to a member of the board, with the result that not infrequently egregious errors creep in that take the breath away the next morning. It is the weak side of the 'Sun.'"

The question of establishing schools of journalism in our universities has often been mooted and even tried. In fact, such a course existed in Cornell a few years ago, and I believe there are others in operation at this moment elsewhere. But most of these attempts have died or are withering, the theoretical killing the practical, which is the soul of journalism. But the undergraduates of all our universities and even of our best high schools, with the wonderful initiative of the American youth, have solved by themselves the problem while their elders have been deliberating over it. No board of trustees or faculty could have produced a better school of journalism than the "Cornell Daily Sun,"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a perfect triumph, it seems to me, of the Student Activities. The only wonder to me is that the English Departments of our universities do not more fully utilize these living student publications, associate them more closely with the class-room work, and, in fact, base the more practical side of the instruction on such excellent foundations. But perhaps this is too much to ask of the pedagogic spirit which so often prevails even in our American faculties.

So far I have dwelt more on the material side of Student Activities. But a brilliant Brown graduate has sent me what might be called the philosophy of the subject, and I now give some extracts from Mr. Hurley's interesting letter. He says:

"They strike me as one of the finest elements in the undergraduate life of our American colleges. They are to us what atmosphere, so called, is to Oxford or Cambridge, what the corps are to Germany, what nothing is for France, so far as I know; and they are to me even better than these. Compared with that oft-mentioned adjunct to Oxford life—atmosphere—they are a typically American development. Their name shows it—activity, energy, virility, initiative power, force, compared with the quiet, orderliness, repose, critical aloofness of the Oxford Students' undergraduate life. To keep up this odious contrast they are the field for robust enthusiasm as opposed to gentlemanly dilettanteism. Better than that from my point of view is the fact that they fit into my idea of what a university should be, viz., a realization of the higher social life. As some one has said, the college man lives in an artificially protected environment; and it is fortunate that he can. Only the aim in America should be to make this environment as near to the ideal state of a democratic society as we possibly can. Now the faculty can equip us with better and broader minds, and libraries and laboratories can provide the materials for work as far advanced as any one can go. But what will give us students the attitude towards the world which will make our widened, deepened outlook of most value is precisely participation in undergraduate life, if that life is of a type such as prevails in my own institution.

"Undergraduate activities call on students for all the virtues of service for their fellow men—the very morality which a democracy lives on, I should suppose. In a small institution, especially, every man must get behind 'the college' and keep up its standard. True, too great emphasis is put on the men who play the games for their fellows. But in our best institutions this evil is not so great as the good that comes from the wholesome devotion to athletic exercise—a devotion which continental young men so badly need. And in our best institutions, too—at least, it is so at Brown—other things besides athletics absorb the student body to a great degree. Wherever debating and philosophical societies thrive and wherever the literary magazines still live, despite

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the baneful influence of the 'practical' engineering courses, the tone of undergraduate life is sufficiently 'elevated.'

"The burning question is, I suppose, whether our best men are not distracted from their work by being called upon to do all the detail management of this complex life that has grown up in the colleges. All I can say is that *noblesse oblige*. I may add that it might seem likely that students without their 'activities' would give more time to the curriculum or to deeper delving in some one line of thought. But I have my doubts about this. The live man finds some excuse for distraction. Student activities lead him into a life where his spare effort and spare time count; and I have always remarked that the thoroughgoing student finds plenty of time for his debate or 'discussion' club without sacrificing a whit of his future career. In fact, I think more might be made of the undergraduate's own activity than is now done."

I fully share the closing statement of Mr. Hurley. My chief criticism of the Activities is that they are left too much in the hands of the undergraduates, or rather that the faculty and the board of trustees do not draw from them all the good that is in them. The first and principal move in this direction should be made through the Fraternities, where could be quickly eradicated most if not all of the evils lurking in these Activities. If these "Greek Letter Societies" were all that they should be the Activities, which have their mainspring there, would be all that they can be. But this is not the place to go into the complex question of the reform of the Fraternities; that is a subject quite by itself. All I wish to say now is that the real character of the Fraternities, or rather the undergraduate side of these organizations, is quite unknown to faculty, trustees and old graduates, strange as this assertion may seem. Exact knowledge of the spirit that rules there can be obtained only by residing with the undergraduates for a long period. Those of us who have done so are in accord as to the importance of "doing something," and when this something is done then, and not till then, will the evils of the Student Activities disappear and all their greater possibilities be attained.

THEODORE STANTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES.

BY W. G. BALLANTINE.

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES was the most "clubable" man that ever lived in New England. He was the incarnation of social communicative geniality. The "Saturday Club," which used to meet at Parker's, and which included Emerson, Hawthorne, Longfellow, Lowell, Motley, Agassiz and others, was the most brilliant company of men of letters that ever forgathered about an American table, and Holmes was, confessedly, the most brilliant talker of them all. His literary work is all self-revelation to a social circle. His prose is confidential talk to a group. His poems are rainbows that flash across the spray of talk. His self-chosen title, "Autocrat of the Breakfast-Table," has never had another claimant.

Conversation differs from lecturing just in the personal element. It is the incidental revelation of personality. Therein lies its charm. Dr. Holmes said, in the "Poet at the Breakfast-Table": "I shall say many things which an uncharitable reader might find fault with as personal. I should not dare to call myself a poet if I did not, for if there is anything that gives one a title to that name it is that his inner nature is naked and is not ashamed." The same principle holds for the conversationalist. For as Dr. Holmes said again: "One cannot gather some of the best fruits of life without climbing out to the ends of the slender branches of the Ego. What have we better worth telling than our impressions of the great show at which we have been looking ever so many years?" This last sentence well describes his writings. They are the record of his impressions at the great show of life. "*Liberavi animam meam,*" he said, which may be freely rendered, "I have made a clean breast of everything." Certain it is that we have never been taken into the innermost

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

confidence of any of our literary men as into that of Oliver Wendell Holmes. And that is the reason why many of us feel for him an intensity of personal attachment we feel for no other. When Emerson and Lowell and the rest have taken their hats and gone home we wheel our chairs up before the fender and talk the day over with Holmes.

Egotism in general is offensive because the ordinary kind is grounded in self-ignorance. The candor of one who confidentially discloses the truth of his inner life is something far different. It is the highest compliment that mind pays to mind. Scientific perspicacity and moral courage unite in it. He who talks truly of himself becomes, *ipso facto,* objective and impersonal and may justly affirm, "This I say of me but think of you, Love." It must be stipulated, of course, that the candor shall be that of a noble, modest, normal soul. The naked shamelessness of old reeling Silenus and his Bacchanalian ruck belongs in another category.

Holmes early discovered the representative quality of his own egotism. He said:

> "I have told my story. I do not know what special gifts have been granted or denied me; but this I know: that I am like so many others of my fellow creatures, that when I smile I feel as if they must; when I cry I think their eyes fill; and it always seems to me that when I am most truly myself I come nearest to them and am surest of being listened to by the brothers and sisters of the larger family into which I was born so long ago. I have often feared that they might be tired of me and what I tell them. But then, perhaps, would come a letter from some quiet body in some out-of-the-way place, which showed me that I had said something which another had felt but never said, or told the secret of another heart in unburdening my own."

So, still at the age of seventy-seven, writing the trivial happenings of his hundred days in Europe, he could say:

> "I have daily assurances that I have a constituency of known and unknown personal friends whose indulgence I have no need of asking. I know that there are readers enough who will be pleased to follow my brief excursion, because I am myself and will demand no better reason. If I choose to write for them I do no injury to those for whom my personality is an object of indifference."

Physically, Dr. Holmes was not particularly well equipped for eminence. In a letter he speaks of himself as five feet five, "not four, as some have pretended." His face he always considered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"a convenience rather than an ornament." He spoke of one of his photographs as "very ugly, but horribly true." He "was not altogether satisfied with what nature had done for him." One of the depressing experiences of his life was the little ripple of disappointment which his bodily presence created among those who had known him only in his books. He tells with charming frankness of the hotel clerk in Harrisburg who "confided to me with infinite naïveté and ingenuousness that, judging from my personal appearance, he should not have thought me the writer he, in his generosity, reckoned me to be."

But whatever scanting there was externally there was none within. There was material there for half a dozen ample personalities. The professor, the poet, the theologian, the man of science, the humorist, the table-talker co-existed complete—six persons in one Holmes. He did a solid life's work as physician and medical professor. His paper on the "Contagiousness of Puerperal Fever" initiated a diminution in the death-rate of young mothers. His name, simply as that of a scientist, has a permanent, if not conspicuous, place in the history of human progress. The wit and the humorist stood upon a solid basis of serious and accurate work. He was trained and accustomed to deal with realities.

The charm of Holmes is in the directness of his perceptions, the dry light of his intelligence, the wholesome spontaneity of all his emotions of mirth, pity or enthusiasm. There was a tranquil unity in his personality. The wonder is in the normal balance of so many faculties ordinarily incompatible. The description that he gave of one of his Parisian teachers may be applied to himself—"Modest in the presence of nature, fearless in the face of authority, unwearying in the pursuit of truth." He was religious after the type that Professor William James denominates "healthy-minded." That is, he was naturally on the side of right. He continued throughout his long life to look at things with the innocent directness of a three-year-old child.

Many of his characteristics arose from the extraordinary rapidity of his thought processes. He observed:

"If you ever saw a crow with a king-bird after him you will get an image of a dull speaker and a lively listener. The bird in sable plumage flaps heavily along his straightforward course, while the other sails round him, over him, under him, leaves him, comes back again,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tweaks out a black feather, shoots away once more, never losing sight of him, and finally reaches the crow's perch at the same time the crow does, having cut a perfect labyrinth of loops and knots and spirals, while the slow fowl was painfully working from one end of his straight line to the other."

The king-bird fashion was always Holmes's with other minds, and, singularly enough, also with his own. Around his own main line of thought he always looped his spirals of wit. And is not this the real secret of humor, to be able to carry on two or more lines of thought simultaneously, to see oneself objectively, from all possible points of view, in all lights, against all backgrounds? And here may be an excuse for punning. The speaker is alive to all the overtones of his vocables. Holmes, like Shakespeare, was an incorrigible punster. He said of a certain man, "I think he does not touch the world at a great many points—in which particular he differs from the porcupine." His grandest hymn, praise to God as Ruler of the sun and stars, is entitled "A Sun-Day Hymn." Yet he himself confessed: "A pun is *prima facie* an insult to the person you are talking with. It implies utter indifference to, or sublime contempt for, his remarks, no matter how serious. . . . People who make puns are like wanton boys that put coppers on the railroad tracks. They amuse themselves and other children, but their trick may upset a freight-train of conversation for the sake of a battered witticism." This is by no means a correct account of the Doctor's own punning, because no wit ever derailed his trains of thought or disturbed his fundamental seriousness. The electric flashes around his wheels did not impede their progress. When, in advancing age, his sight began to fail he wrote that one of his eyes had "a *cat*aract in the *kitten* state of development," he realized and felt all that the anatomist and the poet could know and feel of the fact and its sinister significance.

Wordsworth wrote:

> "The child is father of the man;
> And I could wish my days to be
> Bound each to each by natural piety."

This wish of the Lake poet was the happy fortune of Dr. Holmes. His long life had a singular unity. The very narrowness of its extension geographically gave it intension sentimentally. He grew up to manhood in the house in Cambridge in which he was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

born. With the exception of two years and a half, spent in professional study in Paris, his whole life was passed practically within sight of that spot. For an American of his culture he had travelled very little. An interval of fifty years separated his only two visits to Europe. He went through college without leaving home, and later was for thirty-five years a lecturer in the same institution. With natural piety Dr. Holmes idealized the old gambrel-roofed house and every object within and around it. He loved even "the stone with a whitish band" in the pavement of the back yard. He spoke with emotion of the experience of "dying out of a house"—of leaving it forever, as the soul dies out of the body. "So real," he said, "is the life of a house to one who has dwelt in it, more especially the life of the house which held him in dreamy infancy, in restless boyhood, in passionate youth—so real, I say, is its life that it seems as if something like a soul must outlast its perishing frame." It was so with his later houses. "I had no idea," said the professor, "until I pulled up my domestic establishment the other day, what an enormous quantity of roots I had been making during the years I was planted there. Why, there wasn't a nook or a corner that some fibre had not worked its way into." All these objects about which his affections twined we know in detail. They are immortalized in his verse; they are the illustrations of his prose. We know just what was familiar to his eyes when he looked out of his windows—West Boston Bridge and the little barefoot negroes on it, *fishing for flounders and catching sculpins*; the gulls and the ducks upon the river in wintry weather; and a little further round Bunker Hill Monument.

He loved his ancestry, Dutch, English and American—his grandfathers and his grandmothers. He placed a special value upon his summer home in Pittsfield because it had once been part of the estate of one of his forebears. He loved Colonial history. With his unfailing mixture of reverence and fun, he enjoyed stories of the quaint ways of the Puritans. He loved Cambridge and Harvard University. Above all, he loved Boston—the gilded dome of the State House and the Common. To the former he gave the nickname, "Hub of the Universe," which it will never lose. With him the pleasantry was more than half earnest. He created the character of "Little Boston" in the "Professor at the Breakfast-Table," one of the finest and most

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

original of his creations, in order that he might without offence pour out through the mouth of the misshapen little dwarf what would otherwise have seemed extravagant praises of the incomparable city.

The average American, torn from his Eastern home before he was old enough for any but the most indistinct memories, passing his boyhood in hired houses in various unlovely towns in the vast, crude West, educated at schools without traditions—this American, living now in still another accidental spot, himself a piece of driftwood on a sand-bar, envies a man like Holmes. Many of us who have not had so much geographical drifting have, however, behind us life-stories made up of chapters as inconsequential as if torn from separate biographies and patched together by some blundering redactor. Many of us have yielded for seasons to the pressure of environment, only to rise later in mental insurrection "envenomed with irrevocable wrong." Holmes from the start combined loyalty and independence. He loved everything about him, but as an equal sovereign high contracting party also born in the purple. By unquestioned birthright he unfolded his personality in liberty. As he had never admitted outside domination, so he never had occasion to fling away anything that had once been a part of himself.

With all his enthusiasms, Holmes saw realities in the dry light of truth. He wrote to Mr. George Abbot James:

"How formidable a little cheap knowledge looks to those who are wholly ignorant of its familiar terms. I recollect that the word 'forwarding' made almost a sensation, as Sumner spoke it. What is 'forwarding'? It includes all that part of a bookbinder's work which is necessary to the preservation of a volume. All the rest is 'finishing'—coloring the leather, gilding and ornamentation of any kind. When you hear a distinguished personage using long words or technical phrases that frighten you and make you think how learned he is, and how desperately ignorant you and all your acquaintances are, as soon as the speech is over and the company separates go to your dictionary or encyclopædia and look out his polysyllables, and ten to one you will get him off his high horse in five minutes. If he quotes a Latin sentence, see if 'Bohn's Hand-Book' hasn't got it. If a line of any English poet or prose-writer, look in your 'Bartlett's Familiar Quotations.' This will probably fetch him."

And with all his broad, human sympathies Holmes was every inch an aristocrat. He was always conscious of belonging to a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

superior class. He invented a name for it: "the Brahmin Caste" of New England. By this he meant the people whose ancestors had been college graduates and professional men and social, civil and military local magnates from the seventeenth century down. Sir Walter Scott never dwelt with keener interest on the contrast between the gentleman born and the common man than did Holmes upon the contrast between the young Brahmin from the "mansion house" and the cheaply-gotten-up youth from "the huckleberry districts." This very name, "huckleberry districts," illustrates a talent he had for coining appellations innocent in themselves, based maybe upon some simple and undeniable botanical or geographical fact, but inexplicably and exasperatingly expressive of disparagement. It seems the most natural thing in the world to call institutions of learning that happen to be away from the seaboard "fresh-water colleges." But the term carries with it a connotation of inferiority and stirs resentment. "Mediocrity" is a term that the Doctor often used in a concrete sense to designate a lot of earth-born people, who, stand on tiptoe as long as they might, never could reach up into the intellectual and æsthetic atmosphere of the Brahmins. His own social position was as secure as that of a German who has a "*von*" before his name. He had the comfortable sensation pervading all his veins and capillaries that every fact, historical, geographical, genealogical, religious or educational, leading up to the birth and development of Oliver Wendell Holmes was a fact of distinction. He wrote to Motley:

> "My mother used to tell me that her grandfather (Colonel Wendell) lost forty buildings in that fire [of 1760], which always made me feel grand, as being the descendant of one that hath had losses—in fact, makes me feel a little grand now in telling you of it. Most people's grandfathers in Boston, to say nothing of their great-grandfathers, got their living working in their shirt-sleeves, but when a man's g.-g. lost forty buildings it is almost up to your sixteen quarterings that you knew so much about in your Austrian experience."

Motley, when American Minister at Vienna, had found that nobody who had less than sixteen quarterings in his coat of arms, indicating so many illustrious marriage alliances of his ancestors, could be received at court.

No college class has ever been immortalized as Holmes immortalized the Harvard class of 1829 by the poems which for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forty successive years he wrote for its class days. The comradeship, the mirth, the tender sentiment and the high aspirations of the American college student find a wonderful expression in this cycle. As, thirty-nine years out of college, the Doctor looks round the table at his classmates, now become famous, he exclaims, pointing to one and another:

> "You've won the great world's envied prize,
> And grand you look in people's eyes,
> With HON. and LL.D.
> In big brave letters, fair to see,
> Your fist, old fellow! off they go!
> How are you, Bill? How are you, Joe?"

There is nothing in this sort of stuff to suggest the writer of "The Chambered Nautilus." That poem was written when the author was, to use his own words, in "the highest state of mental exaltation and the most crystalline clairvoyance, as it seemed to me, that had ever been granted to me—I mean that lucid vision of one's thought and of all the forms of expression which will be at once precise and musical."

As a prose-writer Holmes is at his best in his comments upon characters and manners and social life as he saw them around him in New England. His novels, whatever their defects of plot and technical construction, will be read with delight as long as New England is loved. His four volumes of table-talk come very near being novels, since they all contain love-affairs and beautiful portraits of women. His three novels are full of the sparkling sallies that set the table on a roar. The despair, in writing about him, as in writing about Horace, is to know when to stop quoting. "A man's ignorance," he said, "is as much his private property and as precious in his own eyes as his family Bible. Ignorance is a solemn and sacred fact and, like infancy, which it resembles, should be respected." What a vista of experiences is opened by the remark that "Poets who come to recite their verses and reformers who come to explain their projects are among the most formidable of earthly visitations." What a comfort to the discouraged student it is to come across his frank remark about Emerson's Brahma, "To the average Western mind it is the nearest approach to a Torricellian vacuum of intelligibility that language can pump out of itself." How often have we verified the memorandum that "a communicative friend is the greatest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nuisance to have at one's side during a railway journey, especially if his conversation is stimulating and in itself agreeable. 'A fast train and a slow neighbor' is my motto."

Holmes's fun is of a high type. He was the son of a Puritan minister. He drew his first breath, and he grew up in a world of purity and moral dignity. His was the inborn refinement of Christianity. In the utter abandon of hilarity it would have been impossible for him to pass into the realm of indelicacy or profanity. He had escaped the narrowness of Puritanism while retaining its elevation. As spontaneous and as fearless as Burns or Byron, he had nothing to say that a maiden might blush to hear. Of his humorous poems "The Deacon's Masterpiece," or "The Wonderful One-Hoss Shay, a Logical Story," is doubtless the funniest:

> "Have you heard of the wonderful one-hoss shay,
> That was built in such a logical way?
> It ran a hundred years to a day,
> And then of a sudden, it—ah, but stay,
> I'll tell you what happened without delay,
> Scaring the parson into fits,
> Frightening people out of their wits,—
> Have you ever heard of that, I say?"

The first effusion by which, as a college boy, our poet became known to the American public was that patriotic outburst, "Ay, tear her tattered ensign down," which thrilled the national heart and saved the old frigate "Constitution" from being broken up for junk. A natural expectation, after such a beginning, would be to find him pre-eminent among the bards of the Civil War. He was at that time in the heyday of his powers. His son, the present Justice Holmes, was a gallant officer thrice wounded in action. Thus all personal and patriotic emotions combined to inspire him. But, on the whole, his war-time poems are the least characteristic of all that he wrote. He was no Tyrtæus. The battle-field was not his arena. He had not been identified with either side in the fierce struggle that led up to the war. He did not, like the Abolitionists, see the glory of the Lord in the "trampling out of the grapes of wrath." For the time the great turbid flood of popular passions confused his moods and his vocabulary. "I do believe," he wrote to Motley, "that Hell is empty of Devils for this last year; this planet has been so full of them helping

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the secession liars." The utterance is not in the real manner of Holmes, although it contains a Shakespearean allusion; it recalls rather to those of us who are old enough to remember it the kind of eloquence with which Northern regiments were recruited in the early sixties. The delightful Autocrat was eclipsed. But what he said of General Grant is fine: "One of the simplest, stillest men I ever saw. Of all considerable personages I have seen, he appears to me the least capable of an emotion of vanity. I doubt if we have any ideal so completely realized as that of the republican soldier in him. I cannot get over the impression he made on me."

He was no more drawn into the Teetotalism of his times than into the Abolitionism. Residence as a student in France seems to have reinforced in his case the traditions of the older Puritanism in regard to beverages. In a serious passage of the "Autocrat" he said: "I believe in temperance, nay, almost in abstinence, as a rule for healthy people. I trust I practise both." But, just as in reading the life and words of Jesus of Nazareth, we notice the absence of any sense of danger from the seductions of the wine-cup. He seems to have felt that *ex officio,* as a poet he must sing of wine, as he did of love and friendship. One of his poems of the class of '29 begins with the exclamation:

> "Flash out a stream of blood-red wine,
> For I would drink to other days,
> And brighter shall their memory shine,
> Seen flaming through its crimson blaze!"

Unexplained allusion was, perhaps, the Doctor's favorite rhetorical embellishment. One characteristic of his mind was the firmness and scientific severity of his thinking. But another characteristic was the rapidity and poetic affluence of his ideas. He was always the professor of anatomy who saw the skeletons of propositions and their exact articulations. But he was just as much the poet whose imagination clothed those skeletons with breathing beauty and the wit who saw their amusing aspects. The extraordinary swiftness of his thoughts demanded an equally extraordinary richness of materials for the simultaneous activity of all the mental powers. Such could be provided by constant allusions—that is, by the suggestion of volumes there was not time to say. As we pass with him down the main corridors of his thought he gives at each step glimpses into side cabinets or out-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of-door vistas through doors only slightly ajar. With a flash he throws the side-light upon the matter in hand. If our minds are alert and nimble enough to take it all in we get the benefit. But, in any case, not a moment's delay is granted, not a syllable of explanation; the Doctor is at once far ahead on the main line.

Some day some one will write a key to Dr. Holmes's allusions. It will cover a good many pages and learning will be required in him who compiles it. Most of us must confess that the Doctor leaves us not infrequently with the foolish vacancy of one who is conscious of having missed a good point that others see and enjoy. Allusion is a compliment to a bright companion and a humiliation to a dull one. "That sounds like a cock-and-bull story," said the young fellow whom they call John. "I abstained," says the Autocrat, "from making Hamlet's remark to Horatio and continued." Alas! for the reader who does not know his Shakespeare and who does not instantly recall, "There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy." But most of us are equal to an allusion like that. Speaking of the incrustation on the door of an old church in England, which microscopical examination proved to be a human skin, and which was probably taken by Saxons off from some Danish pirate and nailed up *in terrorem,* the Autocrat says, "It was a genuine historical document of the Ziska drum-head pattern." If you don't already know the story of the grim old Hussite leader and his dying directions to have a drum made out of his skin that he might still inspire and lead the faithful in battle you will never learn it from Holmes. The professor says, "The great end of being is to harmonize man with the order of things, and the church has been a good pitch-pipe and may be still. But who shall tune the pitch-pipe? *Quis cus—*" Breaking off in the middle of a Latin word, he adds in parenthesis, "On the whole, as the quotation was not entirely new, and, being in a foreign language, might not be familiar to all the boarders, I thought that I would not finish it." The reader who does not happen to remember *Quis custodiet custodes?* and the meaning of that Latin question, "Who shall watch the watchmen?" here loses scent of the game provokingly. "Achilles," says the Poet, "was little better than a Choctaw brave. I won't quote Horace's line which characterizes him so admirably, for I will take it for granted that you all know it."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dr. Holmes was a profoundly religious man. There is not in all his jests and sarcasms a single irreverent note. But his rejection of his father's theology and of Puritan moods was absolute. The old New England Primer had taught, with the first letter of the alphabet, that, "In Adam's fall we sinned all." To protest against this dogma was the inspiration of a large part of his literary activity. To exhibit how our characters are made for us by pre-natal or other influences for which we cannot be held in any sense responsible is the purpose of his three novels: "Elsie Venner," "The Guardian Angel" and "A Mortal Antipathy." Elsie Venner is a beautiful and gifted girl whose mother was bitten by a rattlesnake a few weeks before Elsie's birth. Thus in her nature were mingled the noble impulses and affections of a woman and the sullenness and sudden murderous malice of the serpent. "Do you want an image of the human will or the self-determining principle, as compared with its prearranged and impassable restrictions?" asks the Autocrat. "A drop of water imprisoned in a crystal; you may see such a one in any mineralogical collection. One little fluid particle in the crystalline prism of the universe!"

Joined with his protest against the doctrine of hereditary sin was his protest against the associated doctrine of eternal misery for a vast portion of mankind. People less than fifty years old to-day cannot realize what it meant to breathe an atmosphere highly charged with those doctrines.

When I was a child in southern Indiana the handful of "New-School" Presbyterians among whom my parents were numbered, being unable to afford an edifice of their own, worshipped in a small building which they rented from the Universalists. This building, familiarly known as "The Little White Church," had been erected by a single citizen of some means for a society so few in numbers and so low in public favor that they could not maintain regular services even after a place had been provided. The audience-room was destitute of architectural beauty, as were all the other churches of that region, except that on the front of the white-painted pulpit there was a circular black medallion bearing in the centre a gilded cross and above it the three golden words "God is Love." Upon that sole object of religious symbolism in the bare room my childish eyes always rested with interest and wonder. It was full of mystery, but also of cheer. But

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as, in the course of time, our feeble congregation gathered a little strength and theirs still further dwindled, the ownership of the modest edifice passed from them to us. The only change made was the removal of the medallion with its golden motto from the front of the pulpit. Nothing was ever said about it in my hearing, and I asked no questions, but none the less deep on my childish mind was the impression that God's love was something which people of correct views did not think best to make too prominent. The same sentiment was in the air breathed by the child Oliver Wendell Holmes, and it became one great purpose of his life to affirm the contrary.

> "That one undoubted text we read,
> All doubt beyond, all fear above,
> Nor crackling pile nor cursing creed
> Can burn or blot it: *God is Love!*"

This man of jests had a heart of tenderest sensibility. He exclaimed to Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe:

> "Pity I feel as if that would be all that would be left of me if I live but a few years longer. To you I suppose sin is the mystery—to me suffering is. I trust that Love will prove the solution of both. . . . Educational suffering I can to a certain extent understand. But the great solid mass of daily anguish which the sun looks upon—and looks away from, as if he could not bear it,—antedating man, including everything that has a nerve in it,—that I can do nothing with."

Holmes did not give up any more of his ancestral religion than was necessary to adjust it to his sunny temper, to his kind-heartedness and to his sense of justice. It was characteristic of him to be free, but not radical. Professor Barrett Wendell says that Dr. Holmes remained through life a sound Unitarian. Probably the Doctor himself thought so. But that beautiful hymn of his, which is in all the orthodox hymn-books:

> "O Love divine, that stooped to share
> Our sharpest pang, our bitterest tear,"

never could have been written by one who was consistently Unitarian in his thinking. The truth is that Dr. Holmes never cared to work out a theological system, but was content to be clear upon the points that seemed to him vital. In general he kept the habits in which he had been brought up. "Would you believe," he wrote to Mrs. Stowe, "that to this day I do not read novels on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sunday, at least until after sundown?" He went to church regularly without much care as to the theology of the preacher. It was only the general benefit, the cultivation of reverence that he was after. "It does me some kind of good, I think," he said. But he wrote to James Freeman Clarke:

"I think you and I are not ardent admirers of sermons in general. They are last year's bird's-nests for the most part,—dried apples in loaded orchards,—empty phials that sick men have drained and died notwithstanding,—the skins of the wise serpents out of which they have crept, carrying their brains with them. Nothing but a pile of old prescriptions is worse reading."

But he tells Clarke, "Your sermons reach down even below Christianity to that plutonic core of nature over which all revelations must stratify their doctrines."

The most interesting of the characters in which we know Dr. Holmes is that of the man growing old. His life had a long afternoon, or rather, we may say, Indian summer. He was within two years of fifty when James Russell Lowell made it a condition of assuming the editorship of the new magazine—"The Atlantic Monthly"—that Holmes should be the first contributor engaged. And it was the "Autocrat of the Breakfast-Table," the series of papers then written, or, as he himself expressed it, "dipped from the running stream of his thoughts," that first made him known to the wide circle of readers. Already the "Autocrat" (if a German idiom may be permitted) contains the professor's paper on "Old Age." "My friend the professor," said the Autocrat, "began talking with me one day in a dreary sort of way. I couldn't get at the difficulty for a good while, but at last it turned out that somebody had been calling him an old man." But as a result of thinking the matter over and reading Cicero's "*De Senectute*," the professor, who of course was Holmes himself, made up his mind to meet "Old Age" half-way. This paper ended with a quotation from the author's then unpublished poem, "The Old Player":

"Call him not old whose visionary brain
Holds o'er the past its undivided reign.
For him in vain the envious seasons roll
Who bears eternal sunshine in his soul.
If yet the minstrel's song, the poet's lay
Spring with her birds, or children with their play,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Or maiden's smile or heavenly dream of art
Stir the few life-drops creeping round his heart,—
Turn to the record where his years are told,—
Count his gray hairs,—they cannot make him old."

These lines never applied to any one more fitly than to the man who wrote them. Even earlier in the "Autocrat" occurs that delightful poem "The Old Man Dreams."

The surprising thing is that the author of these poems and reflections on old age had still six-and-thirty years of vigor and productivity and fame before him. He was not at all at the point at which Emerson wrote "Terminus." But stranger still it is to go back to "the jocund morning of life" and find that in one of his earliest poems the author said:

"And if I should live to be
The last leaf upon the tree
In the spring,
Let them smile, as I do now,
At the old forsaken bough
Where I cling."

That youthful poem showed the two sides of the poet's heart: the sense of humor and the tenderness of sympathy. There was no malice in the fun, but the pathetic aspect of things could not hide from him the comic. No one would take this stanza, if found alone, to be from the humorous poem of a very young man:

"The mossy marbles rest
On the lips that he has pressed
In their bloom,
And the names he loved to hear
Have been carved for many a year
On the tomb."

It is a joy to know that the old man lived long enough to taste to the full the happiness of being appreciated. The unreserved and companionable sympathy that he had offered to his fellow men he received at last in equal measure. He had said:

"I confess to a tender feeling for my little brood of thoughts. When they have been welcomed and praised it has pleased me; and if at any time they have been rudely handled and despitefully treated, it has cost me a little worry. I don't despise reputation, and I should like to be remembered as having said something worth lasting well enough to last."

Such frankness opened hearts; it disarmed criticism and cemented friendship. In America every day's mail brought more testi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

monials than he could read or answer. When he visited England the universities decorated him with degrees, and society, from the Prince of Wales down, overwhelmed him with attentions.

Was Oliver Wendell Holmes a great man? That is not the common impression. His wit was too nimble. One who can put a girdle round about the world of thought in forty seconds is considered lacking in the necessary ponderosity of greatness. We, his partisans, will always hold it a grievance that he, who to us means so much more than most of the great, should be debarred from the Pantheon. To us who were boys half a century ago in out-of-the-way places—southern Indiana, for instance—Holmes came as the Greek *literati* came to Italy, after the fall of Constantinople, and brought a Renaissance. To us he meant the revelation of a bright and joyous intellectual and social world of which we had not dreamed. With his love for big trees and his enthusiasm for fast horses, his irrepressible puns and jokes, his chuckling merriment and his songs, he brought a new zest to life. He dared to call his soul his own. In him we found scholarship without dulness, piety without austerity, courage without animosity, fun without indelicacy, loyal provincialism without narrowness. In him was presented a natural, spontaneous, broad, manifold, interesting, affectionate life, in an age of sectarianism and conventionality. This was worth more than greatness.

Can we close this appreciation with anything else than those lines which Dr. Holmes loved best of all that he ever composed, and which, when asked for his autograph, he oftenest wrote above it—the last stanza of "The Chambered Nautilus"?

> "Build thee more stately mansions, O my soul,
> As the swift seasons roll!
> Leave thy low-vaulted past!
> Let each new temple, nobler than the last,
> Shut thee from Heaven with a dome more vast,
> Till thou at length art free,
> Leaving thine outgrown shell by life's unresting sea!"

W. G. BALLANTINE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE APPROACH OF HALLEY'S COMET.

BY RALPH B. LARKIN.

DURING recent years astronomers have been looking forward with high expectancy to the year 1910, for in that year Halley's comet, the most famous in history, is to return. For thousands of years, and millions, for aught we know, this remarkable object has been returning at intervals to the neighborhood of the earth. History records many of its returns. But only within recent times have its visits been predicted and watched for. For until the days of Sir Isaac Newton, during the latter part of the seventeenth century, it was not known that comets moved on established orbits and that some of them returned at regular intervals. Before that time the comet we now call Halley's had been seen at many of its returns and noted in literature. But its appearances were not recognized as those of one object returning periodically.

Halley, Astronomer Royal of England, witnessed a great comet which flashed forth in the heavens in the year 1682. He noted its course through the heavens from night to night, and conceived the idea of comparing its course with those of previous great comets described in history. His materials for purposes of comparison were meagre, for the descriptions of the courses of previous comets were necessarily crude and imperfect. However, he discovered that the courses followed by great comets in the years 1531 and 1607 were similar to the one which he was then observing in 1682. This led him to suspect that they were not different comets, but one and the same. He further saw that there was an interval of about seventy-six years between them. This confirmed him in his belief and led him to predict with confidence that the comet would return about the year 1758. Of his prediction he said: "Wherefore, if it should return according to our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prediction about the year 1758, impartial posterity will not refuse to acknowledge that this was first discovered by an Englishman."

Of course Halley did not live to see his prediction fulfilled, but as the year approached there was great interest manifested in the outcome. Would the comet appear? We can imagine the intense anticipation of astronomers as the time drew near. And they were not disappointed. The comet was discovered on Christmas night, 1758. It was several months before it was in a position favorable for observation. In April and May it attained great brilliancy. Its tail reached a length equal to more than half the distance from the zenith to the horizon. It was a splendid spectacle.

Its return in 1835 or thereabouts was now regarded as a foregone conclusion, and again it came, awakening great interest. After appearing as a small telescopic object, it was observed in its approach for weeks, getting larger and larger as it drew nearer the sun, and gaining constantly in velocity until it swept round the sun and started back on its outward journey, not to appear again until the year 1910.

For nearly thirty-eight years it kept on its outward course, leaving the sun, as it had approached it, with terrific velocity. Its momentum was so great as to carry it many millions of miles beyond the orbit of Neptune, which is about 2,800,000,000 miles from the sun. The gravity pull of the sun constantly retarded the outward progress of the comet and reduced its rate of motion until it turned back upon its course, which is in the form of an ellipse, and started on its return journey. It has now been speeding this way for about thirty-six years at an ever-increasing rate. Astronomers will soon get glimpses of it through their telescopes and photographs of it will be made. It will constantly increase in size until we shall see it in its glory in the heavens as it rushes by us to sweep round the sun.

In past centuries this comet has produced much mental suffering. People in unenlightened ages saw in it a dire portent of evil and were in terror. Its appearance, for example, in 1456 was just at the time when Europe was in consternation at the victorious advance of the Turks, who had just conquered Constantinople. To the "Ave Maria" was added the prayer: "Lord, save us from the Devil, the Turk and the Comet."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comets, as to their movements, are of two kinds. Those of one kind belong to the solar system and sweep periodically round the sun. Their orbits are closed at both ends—that is to say, they are ellipses. Halley's comet, of course, is of this kind. Comets of the other form of motion are stray wanderers, moving, so far as we know, independently through space. Their wanderings may continue for long periods of time, until they get near enough to our system to feel the gravity influence of our sun sufficiently to be deflected from their courses and drawn in. These approach the sun at great speed (a velocity of more than 350 miles per second has been known), sweep round it, and go away again, never to return. Their orbits seem to resemble either the geometric figure called a parabola or that known as a hyperbola. These figures are closed at only one end, their two arms reaching out into space and never meeting. Hence it follows that comets which hold to such orbits never return. However, if such a comet comes near enough to some of our larger planets to be deflected from its course through the attraction of gravity, the orbit will be changed into an ellipse, which is closed at both ends. The comet will then become a permanent member of the sun's family and will return at intervals. It is not at all improbable that all the periodic comets were captured in this way and forcibly adopted into our family. The "capture" theory is confirmed by the fact that Jupiter, by far the largest of the planets and consequently with the strongest gravity pull, has by far the largest group of periodic comets within the sphere of his influence—that is, with orbits reaching approximately to his orbit.

The velocity of a comet has much to do with the nature of its orbit. No comet on an ellipse can pass the orbit of the earth with a greater rate than twenty-six miles per second, for when a comet reaches this speed it has been demonstrated that it must be at least moving on a parabola. If it much exceed this velocity, it is travelling on a hyperbola.

The nineteenth century witnessed other great comets besides Halley's. The comet of 1811 was a startling apparition, with a tail that at one time measured 100,000,000 miles in length. It was observed for nearly seventeen months. The comet of 1843 was so brilliant as to be visible in full daylight. It was remarkable in that it passed nearer the sun than any other object has ever been known to pass. Donati's comet, in 1858, was 54,000,000

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

miles in length and was visible to the naked eye nearly four months. Its course was computed, and the comet is expected to return in about 2,000 years. Its journey out into space carries it five times as far from the sun as Halley's comet travels, or about 15,000,000,000 miles. The comet of 1861 was very large. It is worthy of especial note that the earth passed through its tail, but without any discoverable effects. The last great comets, those of 1880 and 1882, are still fresh in the minds of many people. The interval since these last spectacular comets has now grown so long that we welcome the approach of the famous one now near at hand.

Comets are very numerous in space. Kepler thought that space is as full of comets as the sea is full of fish. But we see only a minute portion of the great total. Of those that are seen from the earth almost all are faint telescopic objects. Several of these are found each year, the great majority of which are wanderers and never return to our system.

It will doubtless occur to many to ask whether there is any danger of a comet striking the earth. To this it is to be said that there is such a possibility, but the mathematical chance is so slight as practically to be zero. Babinet estimated that such an event will occur on an average once in about fifteen million years. We shall scarcely need to construct bomb-proofs against such bombardment.

But what would happen if a comet were to strike the earth? To this we cannot make a positive answer, for it suggests another question to which we cannot with entire certainty reply: Of what do comets consist?

Modern astronomy feels confident that it can answer this question with but a small margin of uncertainty. It is known that, while comets are often of great dimensions, they are yet not of great mass. Their tails are made up of highly rarefied matter immensely more attenuated than our atmosphere. This was demonstrated when the earth passed through the tail of the comet of 1861 without noticeable effect. The head of the comet, according to the best present knowledge, is not a solid body, but rather a great swarm of meteoric particles, not in close contact, moving along together, and with the power of emitting light. There is difference of opinion as to the size of these particles. Some hold them to be boulders of various sizes—*i. e.*, meteoroids

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

similar to those which fall upon the earth and in inconceivable numbers. Others believe the particles to be smaller, so that a comet may be styled a "gravel bank"; others have called it a "dust-cloud." But in any case the head is not a rigid body, and its mass or weight in proportion to its great dimensions is very small. If a comet were of great mass it would be sure materially to influence the movements of planets near which it might pass. But this does not occur. On the contrary, planets very materially influence the movements of comets—for example, Jupiter, which has corralled so many for our system. If a comet were of great mass and were to come near enough to the earth to influence its motion, we might witness the very interesting phenomenon of the earth being hastened or retarded in its progress, and so changing our calendar, making the year have less days or more, as the case might be, than the almanac shows. But comets have not mass enough to produce this result.

If now we ask the effect of a comet's striking the earth, we will readily see that if the head of the comet is composed of boulders a collision would have disastrous consequences. A rain of millions of great meteoric stones would, of course, bring catastrophe. If, however, it were merely a rain of small particles or dust, we might never become conscious of it, for the particles would never reach us. They would be fused into gas through friction with our atmosphere many miles before reaching the surface. If the gases liberated by friction were in excessive volume, we might suffer discomfort or even disaster. It is estimated that hundreds of millions of meteoric particles strike our atmosphere every day. This would be a serious matter if we were not protected by our great sheltering envelope of air. Occasionally a meteoric boulder is large enough to resist the heat generated by this friction and reaches the surface. This we call a meteorite. The now established connection between comets and meteors is a matter of great interest.

A very interesting comet phenomenon is the fact that the tail is not produced by the motion of the head. If a ball of fire were to move rapidly through our atmosphere, we would not be surprised to see a trail of sparks behind brushed off by friction. One might think that the tail of a comet is produced in a similar way, or that the tail would naturally trail behind because of its being lighter in weight. But this is not the case. In absolute space

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there is no resistance to produce friction. So far as resistance is concerned, a comet could just as well move tail forward as head forward. And precisely this does actually happen. After a comet has swung round the sun and starts on its outward journey, it moves tail first. Whatever may be the direction of the comet's motion, the tail always points away from the sun. This is caused by bombardment from the sun's rays. The repelling power of light is a demonstrated fact. When this bombardment falls upon the comet the tail, being very highly rarefied, responds most readily and recedes to the opposite side of the head.

Photography is now much used in the study of astronomy. Of many recent comets we have good photographs. But since this art has grown up since Halley's comet disappeared, we have nothing but descriptions and drawings to show how it appeared. We may be sure, however, that on the visit it is about to pay us, it will be compelled to sit for its picture many times. It cannot be predicted with certainty that in appearance it will be just as it has been in its past visits, for comets are erratic creatures and not to be entirely trusted. Sometimes periodic comets show irregularities in the time of their return; sometimes they return with form and appearance changed; and sometimes they fail to appear at all, having been lost in some way or destroyed. We shall live in hope, however, that Halley's comet will not now disappoint us, either in the time of its appearance or its brilliancy.

RALPH B. LARKIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DOMESTIC SCIENCE IN THE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES.

BY HELEN SAYR GRAY.

A PREVALENT idea of the study of domestic science is that it is the "fad" of learning to do what domestics do. That is so far as the definition goes, and in part it accounts for the prejudice or indifference manifested toward the subject. There is a large class of careless, apathetic, ambitionless women who are satisfied with the treadmill way in which they manage their homes. They usually consider themselves successful housekeepers, and would be incensed at any intimation that they are not. There is another class of women—those who have studied the subject of housekeeping and realize that the health, energy, morals, habits, manners, appearance, success and happiness of the members of the family depend on the home and deplore that so few women receive any training to fit themselves for the position of home-makers.

The ill effects of ignorance of household art and science are found everywhere, in homes, boarding-houses, restaurants and hotels. In thousands of homes the walls are covered with nondescript paper that is ugly in color and design and soon fades. The carpets and rugs are likewise ugly. The rooms are not living-rooms, but museums cluttered with rubbish—tinsel ornaments, fancy-work and pictures that ought to be in the wood-pile. In the parlor the upholstery is brocaded plush. At the windows are cheap lace curtains. The same amount of money expended on these things would furnish a house well if the owners had any taste or judgment; but with such walls and floor coverings, even if the furniture were beautiful, the place could not be made to look otherwise than cheap, shabby and cheerless. If,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

however, the walls and floors harmonize a room does not need very much furniture and does not look bare even if there are only a few articles in it.

The women who live in such homes use no intelligence in their methods of doing housework. Like the Chinese, they prefer to do things as they have been accustomed to do them. They do not take it as a reflection on their cooking that their husbands seek to supply the deficiency at a saloon and that their children eat between meals at all hours. They use a cook-book that is years behind the times. It never occurs to them to be dissatisfied with it and get the best in the market. Much of the fruit they preserve soon ferments, but they learn no lesson from their failure. As frying is an easy and quick way of cooking, they fry meat and vegetables whenever it is possible. As no attention is paid to ventilation, the house frequently is saturated with the odor of the cooking. Verily, as George Ade says, "There is no place like home, and some men are glad of it."

By such methods they waste money and materials. They would not think of burning up dollar bills, but they do what amounts to the same thing when they spoil food in the cooking. "The natural flavors of foods are spoiled by ignorant cooking, and people who eat such dishes acquire a depraved taste that craves strong condiments," an eminent doctor once said, "the cheaper the restaurant the more bottles of catsup, Worcestershire sauce, mixed pickles and mustard there are to disguise the poor quality of the food."

Owing to the discomfort and irritation produced by their diet, children in neglected homes are ill-tempered. The daughters, accustomed to a slipshod way of doing housework, take no pleasure in it, but find it "weary, stale, flat and unprofitable." They "hate to cook" because they know nothing about cooking. People take no pleasure in doing what they know not how to do. Drudgery is doing over and over what has not been mastered. Any work when mastered gives joy to the doer. Since their homes are so unattractive and uninteresting, it is no wonder that girls want to get away from them. They leave school at an early age to enter a store or factory. When they leave the store or factory to marry, what likelihood is there of their having happy homes, since they are not qualified to do their share to make them so?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The appearance of the members of the family is a good indication of the kind of housekeeping they are accustomed to. They may be proof against mismanagement for a time and look rosy, but eventually they succumb. Bilious eyes, constellations of pimples, complexions like dough or dried apples, and the external symptoms of a hundred and one other ills are conspicuous evidences of the wife's incompetency and cry out, "Behold her handiwork."

Confusion and embarrassment at the unexpected arrival of company to dinner or supper are another indication of neglected housekeeping. Instead of being ashamed only of being caught unprepared, the housewife should be ashamed to sit down to a meal, no matter how frugal, that any one arriving unexpectedly could not be asked to share.

Most illnesses, moreover, come from improper food. A great deal of sickness in a family usually means inefficient housekeeping. Yet the wife never blames herself for the sickness or death of members of the family, but ascribes the untimely ending of their lives to an inscrutable visitation of Providence. Strenuous exertions are made and no expense spared for nursing, medicine and doctors to save the life of a member of the family who is ill; but the prevention of sickness through the study of housekeeping is disregarded. We are obsessed by a belief in the efficacy of medicine. If the schools had not been derelict in their duty we should not have had the worship of Æsculapius continued to modern times.

People whose food-supply day after day contains only perhaps eight or ten of the sixteen chemical elements of which the body is composed and seldom any of the others pay the penalty for not supplying in right proportion and chemical combination all the elements requisite for the growth and maintenance of their bodies; they are only fractional men and women. Farmers know what to feed cows to increase the quantity of milk or to increase or decrease certain constituents in it. Orchardists ascertain that pear-trees need iron, that quince-trees need salt; but no thought is given to feeding the family for efficiency.

The ill effects of bad housekeeping are as conspicuous in the country as in the city. Tradition has more weight in country homes than anywhere else. The law of evolution is very slow in its operation in the home, especially in the country, because wom-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

en who live on farms are so out of reach. They do not try new recipes for anything except some dish they may get when away from home. Unusual dishes would lay them open to the charge of "fancy cooking" and, like demonstrative affection, are looked upon as unseemly. Pancakes, pie, cake, doughnuts, canned fruit, fried foods, bread, tea and coffee, with potatoes three times a day, are the chief articles of diet the year round. Then, sodden with food, the members of the family resort to patent medicines to cure themselves of their self-inflicted ills in an attempt to circumvent the law of cause and effect.

The boarding-houses, even the high-priced ones, in which one can get satisfactory board, are very few. In every establishment most of the boarders would like more hygienic living; but they know that if complaint is made they gain nothing but the ill-will of the proprietor. It certainly would not cost any more—in fact, not nearly so much, to manage a boarding-house with some regard to the welfare of the inmates. The reason it is not done is that the proprietors don't know how and are too conceited to learn. The meals served at the average restaurant and in "pure-food cafés"—or poor-food cafés, as they ought to be called—are as strong an argument as any that could be advanced in favor of the study of domestic science. Even a high price paid for meals in hotels and restaurants is not a guarantee of good food.

Women's clubs and the leading women's magazines are doing a work of inestimable value in arousing public sentiment in favor of the study of domestic science, engaging specialists to write on the subject or teach it and in getting it introduced into the schools. Those publications that employ the best specialists exert a very wide influence. There are publications, however, that have household departments in which some one who has an insufficient knowledge of the subject writes columns of pseudoscientific matter. Such articles on the care of a home are of about as much value as those that appear in the home department of an agricultural weekly, telling housewives how to make "jumbo pickles" and how to make footstools out of tomato-cans.

In large city high schools there is a half-hour intermission at noon, during which the students flock to near-by bakeries and buy for their lunch cake, pie or something of that sort. In a certain large art school where one or two women are allowed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the authorities to furnish lunch to the pupils the menu sometimes has hardly anything upon it but cranberries, pickles, tarts and cream puffs. Knowing what sort of luncheon schoolgirls eat, the Englewood Woman's Club some years ago installed a lunch-room at the Englewood High School in Chicago to provide wholesome food at cost. A woman's club did likewise for the Lake View High School. Would it not be practicable, at least in the elementary schools in poor districts and in large city high schools in which few, if any, of the pupils go home at noon, to have served at school a luncheon prepared by the children themselves under the supervision of the cooking-teachers?

Magazines and newspapers contribute greatly to the education of the public in matters pertaining to the home, but they are an inadequate means. Household science and household arts should everywhere be introduced into the public schools. They are quite as important for young people to know as the binomial theorem or the doings of the Allobroges. Education in household arts and science can be spread more rapidly and efficiently by the public schools than by the home. Why should the teaching of household science be confined to the home? The home is not relied upon to teach other sciences. Where else, if not in the schools, are young people to come in contact with a higher standard of cooking?

Boys should be required to take some of the domestic-science courses. In the Elementary School of the University of Chicago instruction in household science is the same for both sexes until the children enter the high school. Thereafter the courses are optional, at least for boys. If all girls were trained thoroughly in the subject there would not be so much need for boys to study it; but even so it is well to teach it to boys. It helps to raise the standard of housekeeping and of health.

At one of the meetings of the Chicago Woman's Club Mrs. Lyndon Evans quoted some very significant statistics in a plea for the study of domestic arts and science. "Of the 24,000,000 women in the United States above the age of fifteen," said she, "17,000,000 are engaged in housekeeping, 3,500,000 in professional and mercantile pursuits." Is there any other business except housekeeping on the face of the earth in which so many people engage with little or no training to fit them for it? Women are trained for everything else they engage in, but managing a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

home is thought to be so simple and easy that any one can do it well without previous training. Every woman thinks she could keep house, just as every man thinks he could be a successful farmer. Competency is assumed, not acquired.

The study of domestic science in the public schools by no means meets with favor everywhere among the parents. Some are indifferent and others sneer and sniff at it contemptuously. One affected, opinionated woman, when she heard, for the first time, that cooking was being taught in the schools of Boston, New York, Chicago and elsewhere, could not conceal her amusement. To her and others like her domestic science meant nothing but dabbling with cooking-lessons—learning culinary capers. Teaching it in the schools was to her a ridiculous absurdity. "I shouldn't want Margaret to waste her time on cooking at school," she remarked. "I can teach her that at home."

"There is room for instruction in both places," one of the women present replied. "There is more to the subject than learning how to prepare a few fancy dishes that taste good. When the mothers set out to teach the daughters to cook they begin with the making of cake, and usually the instruction ends there."

Another woman, who went out by the day to scrub and wash, used to send notes to the teacher almost every week asking to have her daughter excused from school on the afternoons devoted to the cooking-lessons, on the ground that the child already knew how to cook. Both mother and daughter seemed to think that there was nothing more to be learned.

A teacher who taught only half a day employed her spare time on some courses in domestic science. Then she and her husband decided to set up housekeeping. "I feel sorry for him. His wife has been studying domestic science," remarked a woman of their acquaintance. "At the University where she has been attending, the students make little dabs of this and that. I can see she doesn't know anything about cooking." The opponent of domestic science in this case was a woman with degrees from several colleges who was subject to frequent and very severe sick headaches brought on, as she herself admitted, by dietetic sins.

"Women don't need to read books on housekeeping or study the subject if they have common sense," said another mother, a doctor's wife. "I was married when I was eighteen just after I left school; and my mother had never trained me to do any-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing, as she did not have to do her housework herself. No one could have known less about cooking than I did; but I soon learned, for I had a good mind to help me out." What she ate for her meals showed very plainly the kind of housekeeper she was and how adequate was the "common sense" on which she prided herself. Common sense is not relied upon to furnish a knowledge of chemistry or astronomy. Why should it be in the case of domestic science?

Another mother, a wealthy woman, had her fourteen-year-old daughter excused from cooking-lessons altogether. "Emma will never have any cooking to do," she explained. "She will always have servants. I'd rather she would spend her time on music and art." To superintend servants well a woman must understand the work herself. Otherwise she is only a figurehead. The mother's argument is like that of the country school trustee's, when the question of hiring a college graduate for the village school was under consideration. "I don't believe in studyin' so many things. I don't want my boy to study joga'fy. What's the use? He ain't goin' to travel none. And as for payin' this man sixty dollars a month, I with a team of horses couldn't earn that amount in that length of time."

It is taken as a matter of course, no matter what is to be the pursuit later in life, that arithmetic must be studied. In days to come household arts and science will be regarded in like manner. Lessons in those subjects will begin when the child first enters school and will not be regarded as interfering with the study of music, art or anything else any more than arithmetic and geography do.

The teaching of domestic science is sometimes opposed by the women who serve on boards of education. Mrs. Keough, who was the only woman member of the Chicago Board of Education at the time "fads" were dropped from the schools in New York City, was reported as approving of the action of the New York Board. She was quoted in one of the Chicago papers as saying: "It is absurd to waste time and money in teaching cooking and sewing in the Chicago schools. Any girl can pick up these things at home; it would be better for the school to devote its whole attention to essential studies. It would be better for the school children of Chicago if they were given piano-lessons in the schools instead of instruction in domestic science and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

household arts. The place for the child to learn cooking and sewing is in the home. I never knew how to cook or sew until I became a wife. It is better to get the culture first and the cooking and sewing afterwards." When asked what she would leave in the curriculum, she mentioned, among other things, physical culture. "I should leave that in, as it builds up the health of the child." How inconsistent to advocate leaving in physical culture, on the grounds of its improving the health, and yet oppose domestic science, a knowledge of which has far more effect on the health. Both are essential. Dr. Gulick, physical director in the New York schools, has shown, by means of tests, that physical culture as commonly taught fatigues school children more than any other of their lessons, and bores them into the bargain.

The effects of teaching household art and science in the public schools and of inspiring high ideals of home-making are incalculable. The improvement of the home is one of the greatest moral reforms and the greatest social reform to be brought about. It is the greatest social reform because it will affect every home. In books of American history this century will be characterized as the era of improved housekeeping, and the teachers of it as twentieth-century missionaries spreading the gospel of hygiene. Simultaneous with the great temperance movement that is sweeping the country is the spread of domestic-science teachings.

The instruction will begin in the primary grades and will be supplemented with sufficient practice to produce skill. By the time girls are graduated from high school they will have some knowledge of food values and combinations, of sanitation, of the warming, lighting and ventilation of houses; they will know what methods are best to use in doing housework; they will be able to sew and make garments, to prepare menus for the daily meals, and to cook simple every-day dishes without rendering them innutritious. Girls thus trained will make their parents' homes more attractive and their own when they marry.

When unwholesome foods are no longer served the chief cause of drunkenness will be removed. Considering the unattractive homes of most men addicted to drink, it is no wonder that the saloons have so many patrons. Last winter I met a woman who was going about lecturing on "Gospel Temperance." "Intemperance is one of the greatest hindrances to the spread of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gospel," said she. "I speak in the churches and call attention to this fact and urge them for that reason to include temperance work in their efforts and not leave it to organizations outside of the church." She had a horror of fermented beverages, but the evils from fermented foods were a subject to which she gave no attention, though for years she had suffered from them and often was confined to her bed for weeks at a time. Whether one is poisoned by undigested food or by alcohol, the results are alike disastrous. Those who are sick from autointoxication are no less a burden to the community than those who drink liquor in excess.

When housekeeping is taught in the schools there will be fewer deserted wives. There are said to be eight thousand deserted wives in Chicago. The only thing astonishing about these figures is that they are not bigger, considering the number of ill-kept homes. How can the ties of family affection be strong in ill-kept homes?

It is said that the American race is deteriorating physically. This assertion seems to be borne out by one's own observation. How few people one sees who are perfectly well, and how many of those even have some ailment or other. And it is not to be wondered at that this latter class is so large when one sees the family dietary. Statisticians say that one-third of all the children in America die before they are a year old, and that the average age at which men die is thirty-five years. A quotation from Shakespeare, which is very appropriately printed on the title-page of a recent cook-book, tells us the reason: "Men die because they know not how to live." With improved housekeeping sickness will be decreased in direct proportion to the increase of intelligence and vigor and longevity added to life. People are beginning to realize that sickness is unnecessary and might be avoided by hygienic living, and they are coming to see that hygienic living is not, as is commonly supposed, something unpleasant; that it does not mean subsisting largely on breakfast foods.

The large colleges for women would naturally be expected to take the lead in introducing the study of domestic science, instead of being forced into line by public opinion and slipping at the end of the procession after the initiative has been taken by the public schools, the universities and numerous private institutions. But so far Radcliffe, Bryn Mawr, Vassar, Wellesley,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Smith and Mount Holyoke have stood conspicuously aloof from the battle waged in behalf of household science. Meanwhile the study has been introduced into the public schools in many cities, into many of the large co-educational State universities and into the agricultural colleges throughout the West.

Since the colleges have been reluctant to make room for courses in household science, one is led to ask if they have supplied anything better in its place. Until quite recently the curriculum was overloaded with languages, and the majority of the students got little else. It cannot be argued that such education is of very much benefit to the victims of it. Unless they are self-complacent, the thought of what they have missed that they might have had must be a painful one. Courses are offered in epistemology and in the Scandinavian languages. Hours are spent on the topography of the Roman forum, determining just where the rostra stood, and months, even years, are devoted to theses on the Erectheum, the Particle "hoti," the Position of the Greek Verb in Subordinate Clauses, the Use of Certain Prepositions in Petronius, the Ontological Implicates of Practical Reason, an Epistemological Study of Presophistic Philosophy, Political Conditions in Venezuela and the Tariff on Putty! There is time for all this, but it has not been thought worth while to spend any time on the study of household science. Any schoolgirl knows what verbs govern the dative, but how many know anything about the foods that affect the body?

Whenever a student's health fails the only reason people assign for it is that "she has overworked." Work seldom hurts any one. It is the adverse conditions under which it is done that are harmful. A girl rarely breaks down from overwork, but because she was not properly fed or because inadequate provision was made for physical work, exercise and recreation. Many people are opposed to the higher education of women, because, they contend, it usually causes physical deterioration. That is a very short-sighted view of the case. Impaired health is not an inevitable consequence of a college education. Their campaign should be directed, not against the higher education of women, but against the adverse conditions under which it is obtained.

The board-furnished college students is something to "make the judicious grieve." How much longer will the outrage be perpetrated of providing foods poor in quality, spoiled in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cooking and grouped together into execrable menus? The appearance of those who are most easily susceptible to such a diet is a strong indictment of the management. Pallid, anæmic students, "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought," with round shoulders and sunken chests, dragging around with an armful of books are a repulsive sight. If a student arrived in college in that condition the college ought to be a place where she would get over it and learn how to keep well. "A man must be a good animal before he can be anything else," says Herbert Spencer. But a glance at the undergraduates in colleges and universities, and especially at the candidates for advanced degrees, always shows some who are "fit only for the scrap-heap." Often the less the physical foundation the greater the zeal for learning. They have scholastic ideals, but not physical ones. There ought to be a vigilance committee to attend to such a case; but instead the university or college encourages her in her misdoings by rewarding her with a graduate scholarship or a fellowship or with a *summa cum laude*. Next she is caught in the lure of a Ph.D. She is "elected to be damned," but she does not realize it. The next you hear she has broken down.

Most of the leading colleges for women are enlarging the scope of their gymnasium work and have added corrective gymnastics. In so doing and introducing into the curriculum games and pastimes—golf, dancing, fencing, tennis, rowing, swimming, ball, bowling, etc.—they have made a marked advance. The introduction of games is a most salutary change, not only because of the physical benefits, but because of the social value of play: students become better acquainted in an hour of play than they otherwise would in a year. But games and gymnastics alone are not enough to safeguard their health.

In every school instructors are discharged for incompetency, but the managers of dormitories are not. If things were as they should be the college authorities would provide board for all resident students and put domestic-science experts in charge of the dormitories and student commons. There would then be a few places where dietetic crimes would not be committed. The aim would be to make the dormitory table a model. Limited funds might often necessitate the selection of inexpensive foods; but they would be excellent in quality and properly cooked, however low the allowance; intelligence would be used in making out

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the menus. It would be a good plan to have several commons with board at different prices, thus enabling those students who pinch along on an allowance of two and a half or three dollars a week for table board to take their meals at the commons and yet not forcing all to live so frugally. Scientific management of the cuisine has been undertaken in the dormitories of several of the large women's colleges and co-educational universities.

It is strange, since multi-millionaries give so lavishly to colleges and universities, that they have not given money for the scientific management of student board, nor for the establishment of departments of household science. Once introduced, the courses in domestic science, at least some of them, should be compulsory. Otherwise the students who are planning professional or other careers would omit the courses on the ground that in their business they will not need to know anything about foods and cooking. Such a knowledge would be one of the best investments in vigor and success that they could possibly make. But they scorn and disregard everything except what they think pertains to their chosen work. Then when the goal of their ambition is in sight, Nature mocks them with an attack of gall-stones or nervous prostration or an early death.

If parents cannot afford to educate both sons and daughters it would be better to educate the daughters, because as mothers they have so much more influence over the lives of their children than the fathers do. But such a choice is not advisable, unless girls are given the kind of education that will justify such a radical departure from custom. Let women take up as much else as they like and as they can; but, whatever pursuit they engage in, they should have an adequate knowledge of housekeeping. To quote Mrs. Celia Parker Woolley, "The first duty of a woman, as a citizen, is to be a good housekeeper."

HELEN SAYR GRAY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JOHN CALVIN, LAWYER.

BY THE REV. HENRY COLLIN MINTON, D.D., LL.D.

THE fact that a large part of Christendom is this year celebrating the four-hundredth anniversary of John Calvin's birth is *prima facie* proof that the immortal Genevan's career had in it some of the true elements of enduring greatness. No name to-day, ancient or modern, can start more arguments or kindle fiercer controversies than his. None elicits more extravagant eulogies on the one hand or more cruel calumnies on the other. Calvinism is Calvin writ large, and Calvinism is to one camp of thought the red flag that irritates and angers, while to another it is little less than the crystallized essence of imperishable truth. It is easy to believe that an intelligent acquaintance with the man and his teachings is no more required for the task of execrating than of idealizing, and it is safe to say concerning those that caricature and curse as well as those that exalt and praise that a genuine first-hand knowledge of the personality of the great reformer, of the actual nature of his many-sided work, of the real principles which he taught or of his posthumous influence upon history is by no means in every case an indispensable requisite for their work.

In most men's minds Calvin figures as the great thinker of the sixteenth century, who did more than any other to organize the intellectual elements and to co-ordinate the social forces of the Reformation. He was nothing if not intellectual, and he brought his mighty powers to bear upon the mysterious and perennial problems of religion; and so it is that he stands, classed with such spirits as Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, as one of the few great theologians of the past. This is true, and yet how many forget, if they ever knew, that Calvin was never ordained as Roman Catholic priest or as Protestant preacher of the gospel.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Judged by history, he was at least as much a statesman as a churchman. Although Sir William Hamilton says: "Looking merely to his learning and ability, Calvin was superior to all modern, perhaps to all ancient divines," yet this great divine was only a layman and a lawyer, and whatever of honor or of dishonor attaches to his name must go to the learned and liberal profession of the law. His father, at Noyon in France, was himself an ecclesiastic, but he dissuaded his brilliant and precocious son from taking orders and prepared him for the more lucrative vocation of the law. He pursued his legal studies under two very famous jurists, Petrus Stella and Andrea Alciati, rival leaders of their time. He received the degree of Bachelor of Laws at Orleans February 14th, 1531, and on leaving the university was offered the degree of Doctor of Laws without the usual fees by the unanimous consent of the professors. It is recorded that he distinguished himself so highly in these studies that on one occasion, when the professor was absent for a few days, the youthful Calvin was requested by him to take his place, and he did so with great dignity and success.

Without question Calvin's training for the law greatly influenced his whole work. Dr. Philip Schaff says ("History of the Christian Church," Vol. VII, p. 306): "The study of jurisprudence sharpened his judgment, enlarged his knowledge of human nature and was of great practical benefit to him in the organization and administration of the Church in Geneva, but may have also increased his legalism and overestimate of logical demonstration."

Calvin's career was the legitimate product of his principles. He was a genius, and a genius possesses that marvellous versatility of faculty which transcends the limitations of local conditions and vocational training. Calvin the lawyer was a greater theologian than many a learned prelate or parson, because he had the rare gift of insight into the great problems of the Infinite. His study of law could have been no mere conning of statutes or reciting of precepts and precedents, but with his *penchant* for the underlying philosophy of all human phenomena he must always have been pondering the science of jurisprudence and measuring the forces that make and sustain the social fabric. He studied under the *régime* of the old Justinian Code, and to a mind like his, with the best education the universities of his time afforded,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with his fine humanistic culture, with his wide sweep of vision, and with his penetrating powers of observation and of inference, no code could cramp his thought and no book of statutes could limit the range of his reflection.

And yet those early days at Orleans had been fixing the moulds of his maturer thinking. His theology was to be cast in the categories of jurisprudence. The lawyer begins with the first datum of *authority*. He deals with a rule of action imposed by a superior, which an inferior is bound to obey. The sanctity of that authority is the first condition of the social order, and the maintenance of that order is absolutely necessary to the lawyer's world.

Calvin the theologian is Calvin the lawyer transferring his thought from the sphere of human jurisprudence to that of the divine. Unlike that other great jurist-theologian, Hugo Grotius of Holland, his conception of God is that of judge rather than that of governor. Calvin's theology, like every theology that strikes its plummet straight to the bottom, was also a theodicy, and it is just this theodician valuation of it which presents both the seed-thought and the crux of his whole system. His conception of the universe is essentially theistic. The world is theogenetic — God-originated; it is theocentric — God-centred; it is theocratic—God-governed; it is theologic—it has its *rationale* in God. God is Creator and Governor of all; but above everything else, He is Judge of all; and this is the juristic principium on which he builds his whole system.

In speaking of Calvin's system-building, it must be observed that what differentiates his theology from a philosophy is the fact that the source from which he drew his material was not the intuitions or excogitations of his own consciousness, but the teachings of what he devoutly accepted as the inspired Word of God. If he posited his authority by faith, that faith, he held, was not without or against reason; and in any case it gave him the authority he must have. Protestantism, to be sure, has all along been charged with repudiating an infallible pope and substituting for it a less to be preferred infallible book; but, it is replied, the charge is based upon a misapprehension. Infallibility is strictly predicable of a person rather than of a thing. God only is infallible, and the Book is the attested, veracious and trustworthy revelation of His will. A man may presume to usurp the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

functions of the infallible, but a book never. It is not the book, but the God who speaks by and in the book that Protestantism holds in supreme veneration. John Calvin found his data in the book, and the prodigious powers of his synthetic genius arranged into a logical and systematic order the truths which Scripture furnished him. In the technique of this system the legal training of his mind is evident both in the positive structure and in the keen dialectic with which he anticipates and refutes opposing views.

Calvin's view of everything else took its cue from his view of God, and that view was based upon certain legalistic conceptions. The integrity of God's government waits for its consummation and its vindication upon His righteous judgment in the end. His law is not only an order for His creatures to obey; it is a principle which regulates even His own dealings with His creatures. He is not legislator only, He is not administrator only; He is the Supreme Judge and as such, so to speak, He is superior to Himself as the Supreme Ruler of the world.

Calvin's God is not the deification of some one attribute, as power or justice or love; nor is He the apotheosis of some mere prerogative as, for example, that of sovereignty, as is so often affirmed. His belief in God's sovereignty over the world is only a corollary from his conception of what God is. Predestination, taking the finalities of the future into its purview, is only a necessary sequence, a logical implicate, of the same theistic postulate; and certainly to us men it must be that the consummation of his purposes waits for the final assize of the Supreme Court of the Eternal Right. To this test Calvinism has always had to come. Is its scheme just? Is its God righteous? Is its view of the destiny of moral beings, of the course of free and responsible agents, of the divine attitude toward human personality, right?

Calvin was fully sensible of the gravity of this test. He rested on the faith that the Judge of all the earth will do right. He safeguarded the rights of real freedom, while denying the freedom which exists only in the name; he accorded to man the royal rights of personality in that he possesses the responsible power of choice, which, however, is not incompatible with the overarching, all-embracing control of another. He affirmed the holiness of the divine, while yet that divine ordered, but never itself

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effectuated, the evil that blights the world; that evil is born of free creature-spirits endowed with powers of self-initiating efficiency; and underlying all this was the more or less definite legalistic conception of Authority without which there could be no world of order and no adjudication of the rights and wrongs of time or of eternity.

But Calvin's training in the law shows itself in the substance as well as in the form of his thought. The lawyer's postulate of authority is everywhere in evidence. By temperament he was a student and a recluse; by force of circumstances only he was the teacher of the people and the leader of a movement. Calvin himself was no democrat. His influence has always been for the development of democratic principles and progress, but he himself was in principle rather an aristocrat than a democrat. Both in State and Church, he traced authority to a source above and not below. Only under certain conditions is the *vox populi* the *vox dei;* and those conditions are rarely realized. The seat and source of all legitimate authority is in the Supreme God. His law is final, and the violation of it is bound to be avenged. Theology finds the law of God in His word; it calls its violation sin and the penalty eternal death. Ethics finds its law in the constitution of man, individual and social; it calls its violation vice and its penalty self-ruin. The state finds its law in its constitution and statutes; it calls its violation crime, and its penalty is of its own arbitrary determining. Thus viewed, sin, vice and crime are distinct factors, being infractions of as many different standards. But while the statesman deals with crime, the moralist with vice and the theologian with sin, the philosopher, piercing beneath the surface, perceives that the three standards are, after all, not three, but one.

Man is not only God's creature, but His image also; and though the image is broken, yet the reason that is in him is, to use Lotze's phrase, "the pale copy" of the divine Reason, and therefore man's moral sense is an expression or at least an echo of God's law; hence vice, which is essentially a violation of man's own nature and entails a destruction of the best that is in him, is, after all, a violation of the law of God.

Moreover, "the powers that be are ordained of God"; the theocratic idea of the state need not be pushed very far until we see that crime, which is the breaking of its law, is also a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

violation of God's law as well. Thus we see that the three conceptions merge into one and to a Calvin, who sees God in all things, that one is primarily that of sin. God is the great legislator for human affairs. Any Congress or Parliament that enacts laws inconsistent with His is a usurper, and to violate its statutes makes the criminal but marks the saint. Legal right when morally wrong is to be honored by good men only in the breach, and legal wrong when morally right is to be consecrated by a persistent maintenance. Human lawmakers have no right whatever to legislate except as they republish and apply what is eternally right, whether men sanction it or hold it in contempt. God's law of right is the constitution of constitutions, and no statute of men which is inconsistent with it is valid for their conscience or their conduct.

Nor is this the fiction of a scholastic theologian. It has its illustration in every civilized modern state. The invasion of a personal right is an offence not only against the person, but against the state. An Englishman's theft of his neighbor's purse is not a wrong against his neighbor only; it is a crime against the Crown. An American's assault upon the person of his fellow is a crime against the whole body of the people; and in England "the Crown," in America "the people," will prosecute and punish the offender. A tort is not a private wrong only; it is a public crime. Sir Henry Maine tells us ("Ancient Law," third American Ed., p. 359) that in primitive jurisprudence "the criterion of a delict, wrong or tort, is that the person who suffers it and not the state is conceived to be wronged"; and so the very development of the law of tort into the law of crime marks the advance of civilization from the infancy of jurisprudence. The authority of the state interposes and avenges what it regards as an offence against its own Majesty. Only construe personally this theory of government and we have found no final tribunal this side the authority of the living God.

Calvin held this view absolutely. All wrong is sin. "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned and done this evil in thy sight." This was the spirit of his age, and, while the Genevan was the creator of later ages, he was, of course, largely the creature of his own. His exaltation of the divine was the impulse that gave birth to the emancipation of the human. It is no accident that for so long Switzerland has been the home of freedom. Calvin

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was far less concerned for forms of government than for its spirit,

> "For forms of Government let fools contest
> What's best administered is best."

His methods may seem to us harsh and crude, but he was dealing with hard conditions to which this age is a stranger. He was standing upon the heritage of tradition. The *corpus juris* of Rome and of the Holy Roman Empire enforced the absolutism of authority. The pontifical jurisprudence had formally consecrated, but still perpetuated the idea. The Middle Ages had witnessed the growth of cruel conditions and arrogant despotisms, and it was the chief characteristic and splendid achievement of the Renaissance that, in the sphere of thought, in the wide outreach of its intellectual interests as well in the deep soundings of its spiritual life, this conception of authority was retained, but modified, refined, tempered and related to all the affairs of men's social and religious life.

Right or wrong, this was Calvin's view of authority. All right is God's right, and therefore all wrong is against God. In this we see Calvin the lawyer applying to the confused conditions of his age and place the principles of Calvin the theologian. Permanent advance is often effected through painful experience. Calvin's work as magistrate of Geneva was the application to concrete conditions of the principles of his faith. His influence was personal, not official. He never held a civil office. Indeed, he lived in the city for years before he became a citizen of Geneva.

In many minds the connection of John Calvin with the burning of Servetus in Geneva, in 1553, is the sun-spot big and black enough to hide the sun of his name and fame. It is now over three and a half centuries since that event, and certainly this should be long enough to cool the passions and clear the judgment of mankind. The twentieth century would give little heed to any partisan who begins his brief by insisting that Servetus, however virulent his heresy, however violent his blasphemy, however insolent his spirit, ought to have been put to death. If Calvin had it done or could have lawfully prevented its being done, then every honest man, Calvinist or anti-Calvinist, judging in the light of the present, must pronounce him grossly in the wrong. But Calvin knew the law, and the presumption is very strong,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from his course at all other times, that the prejudices of the theologian did not affect the duty or the honor of the lawyer.

Servetus was charged with the twofold crime of heresy and blasphemy; both of these were crimes long before the day of Calvin. Having been found guilty of these crimes, Servetus appealed to the "Churches Abroad" and Calvin was directed by the Council to make extracts from Servetus's writings to be submitted in the trial. When the churches of Zurich, Bern, Basel and Schafhausen joined in the trial their finding confirmed that of the civil court. Thereupon the "Little Council" sentenced Servetus to death by burning and ordered that a printed copy of his book be burned with him.

It is difficult for us Americans to understand how heresy could be a crime; but what has been said opens the way for the explanation that a denial of the truth of God is a violation of the law of God, and as the state is God's organ of government the sin is also a crime. Sir Henry Maine suggests that heresy was reckoned an ecclesiastical offence because it was "supposed to be included in the First and Second Commandments." The Justinian Code made heresy a crime cognizable by the civil courts and punishable with death. Servetus's heresy was abhorrent alike from the Roman Catholic and the Protestant point of view, and his fatal visit to Geneva was an escape from the stake to which the Roman Catholic authorities had condemned him.

But Servetus's crime included blasphemy also, a crime in almost every state since the days of ancient Israel. It is a crime to-day in the United States, and many of the States have records of its punishment. Judge Kent has said: "No Government among any of the polished nations of antiquity and none of the institutions of modern Europe (a single monitory case excepted) ever hazarded such a bold experiment upon the solidity of public morals as to permit with impunity and under the sanction of their tribunals the general religion of the community to be openly insulted and defamed. The very idea of jurisprudence with the ancient lawgivers and philosophers embraced the religion of the country."

But was not Servetus's punishment incommensurate with his crime? Certainly, we being judge. But the law fixed the penalty. The Jewish law imposed the death penalty and the tragedy of Calvary was consequently enacted. Pagan Rome burned its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Atheists" or threw them to the wild beasts. The code of Justinian punished heretics and blasphemers as malefactors and in Scotland the same law existed, and as late as 1696 Thomas Aikenhead was executed in Edinburgh for heresy. The English Common Law made blasphemy a capital crime. Until 1824 the English laws punished with death one hundred and sixty crimes and, in our own America, witchcraft was punished by death as late as 1692, a little more than two hundred years ago. All this shows nothing except that the horrors of Servetus's death were not exceptional. The fact is that Servetus was tried by a civil court for a crime with which he had been charged and that, being found guilty, he was punished according to the law that then existed.

We are not concerned to acquit Calvin of the charge which has been so often made that he as "Dictator" drove the "Little Council" on to the sentence and its execution. We do not believe that a careful and unprejudiced examination of the chronological order of events in Geneva leaves any grounds whatever for the charge. While the Servetus trial was on, Calvin was *persona non grata* to the "Little Council." Berthelier championed Servetus, not because he loved Servetus, but because he hated Calvin, and during the process of the trial the council ordered Calvin to admit him to the communion and Calvin refused to do it. In February, 1553, the elections gave a sweeping victory to the Libertines and to believe that Calvin was able to influence his bitter political enemies against Servetus, or in any other way at just that time, is to credit him with a power greater than his most ardent disciples have ever claimed for him.

Calvin had a lawyer's clear conception of the relations that should exist between Church and State. The same principles that made him a republican in civil government made him a Presbyterian in the Church. He did not insist upon the absolute separation of Church and State, for God is the head of both, and yet he held to the two distinct spheres of Church and State. In matters purely spiritual the Church owes no allegiance to any power in the state; in the regulation of her own doctrine and worship she knows no authority superior to her own. The Church is not, however, a purely spiritual entity; she has organizations and equipments and properties, and in safeguarding her proper rights against all comers she may have occasion to seek re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dress in civil courts. When this happens the Church must cheerfully accord the supremacy of the state. She seeks the vindication before civil tribunals of her civil integrity and her legal rights, and when she thus becomes a litigant she must consent to have her proceedings scrutinized and her acts judged to the end that her claims may be sustained; and if sometimes the courts decide that her actions have been without warrant in her own constitutional provisions or have been in violation of the laws of the state, and are therefore pronounced invalid, then as a lawful subject and loyal litigant she must submit to the final judgment. But such a judgment, favorable or unfavorable, is forthcoming only when some civil right is involved and never merely upon the spiritual actions and interests of the Church herself.

This great principle is based upon the Protestant conception that the Church is a spiritual institution with Jesus Christ as its only head. It is the view held by Protestants in countries where there is no establishment; it is the happy principle that is accepted by all Churches in this country.

It was Calvin the theologian's doctrine worked out constructively in Calvin the lawyer's city. The great lawyer of Geneva was easy master of the philosophy of the law. His was a constructive mind, and he lived at an age when such a mind was the supreme necessity. In America he would have been a James Wilson and a Jonathan Edwards in one. He was no writer of sketchy briefs; he was no corporation counsel and director; he was no "business lawyer," whatever that may be. John Calvin, theologian, educator, pastor and reformer, was a lawyer by training and profession, and although we can hardly say that reforms and reformations were his pastime or theological systems a chance by-product of his big and busy brain, yet this man whom Renan called "the most Christian man of his century" was only a pale, frail layman of Geneva without a tiara and without a crown. We believe that his "Institutes" could hardly have been written as they are if he had not been trained in the keen logic and dialectic of the law, and that the Reformation would have been without its greatest intellectual prophet if he had not had his wits trained and sharpened in the law schools of Alciati and Peter the Star.

HENRY COLLIN MINTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT VERSUS THE INITIATIVE AND PRIMARY NOMINATIONS.

BY HENRY M. CAMPBELL.

No system of popular government can long endure which does not truly reflect the will of the people. In this enlightened age, and particularly in this country, no one will be so bold as to deny this fundamental fact. For some years past, however, a sentiment has been growing that our present representative system has failed in this respect, and the clamor for a change has been becoming louder and more insistent, until to-day what is commonly known as the "Initiative" or "direct legislation" has found a place in the laws of several of our States, and proposals for its introduction are pending in others. Along the same lines, and of like character, is another popular demand for primary or direct nomination of party candidates for office.

These ideas first found voice in the political platforms of the greenback and democratic parties; but of late they have been to some extent—particularly the idea of primary nominations—incorporated in some of the State platforms of the Republican party and also in the laws of some of the States. This latter fact indicates that the subject has ceased to be one of only partisan interest, and in consequence the proposed innovations demand serious consideration and a careful examination.

In order to fully understand the scope and extent of the radical changes which these proposals involve, it is necessary to consider wherein they differ from the present accepted form of representative government. Two forms of government by the consent of the governed have always been, and are to-day, universally recognized—the representative or republican form and the democratic or direct form. Each, in its own way, aims at accomplish-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the same end, namely, to give effect to the wishes of a majority of the people. Under the representative system, the people select their delegates to act for them, who meet, exchange views and deliberate before action is taken. Under the democratic system, the people themselves vote directly upon all questions; consequently, no opportunity is afforded for mutual discussion, deliberation or modification of views, except in the most casual way.

The "Initiative" method, so called, is essentially democratic in its character. Its avowed purpose is to eliminate the representative principle from the scheme of government, and to give free rein to every person to initiate such laws as he may choose, and to compel the submission of them to a vote of the people. Any person may propose any law, however intricate, or any amendment to the Constitution, even though it abolish all existing forms of government, and if some specified number of persons endorse the petition, the proposition is submitted to a popular vote, exactly as proposed, without opportunity for any modification or amendment, and without discussion, except such as may be afforded by interested newspapers or current agitation. The idea is not a new one. The principle is the same as that which underlies all democracies, namely, that the people themselves vote directly upon all questions, instead of submitting them to the consideration of a representative body.

It is only in small and intimate communities, like the New England town meeting, that the idea has ever been workable at all, and then only because it was possible for the people to meet *en masse,* where some opportunity was afforded for mutual discussion and enlightenment. Whenever it has been exercised in a larger field, the invariable result has been the downfall of the government which adopted it. The world's history for more than two thousand years is filled with examples of the failure of governments based upon democratic principles.

In view of the wide-spread demand for some change in our governmental system, it is also important to consider wherein the representative system has failed, the reasons for such failure and whether a reversion to democratic methods will afford the desired remedy.

The history of the adoption of the representative form of government, both for the nation and the several States, is both interesting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and instructive. No wiser or more patriotic body of men ever assembled in the cause of liberty than the members of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, who met in Philadelphia to frame a Constitution for this nation. They were well versed in the history of government and inspired by the highest motives. The great question considered in that notable convention was the character of the new government—whether the representative or the democratic form should be adopted. The difference between the two forms was well understood, and the debates upon the question were as profound and exhaustive as the world has ever known, either before or since. Nowhere has this difference been better stated than by Madison in the Tenth Essay of the "Federalist," and what he then wrote is as true to-day as it was when the Constitution was adopted. He says:

"From this view of the subject, it may be concluded that a pure democracy, by which I mean a society consisting of a small number of citizens, who assemble and administer the government in person, can admit of no cure for the mischiefs of faction. A common passion or interest will, in almost every case, be felt by a majority of the whole; a communication and concert result from the form of government itself; and there is nothing to check the inducements to sacrifice the weaker party or an obnoxious individual. Hence it is that such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths. Theoretic politicians, who have patronized this species of government, have erroneously supposed that by reducing mankind to a perfect equality in their political rights, they would at the same time be perfectly equalized and assimilated in their possessions, their opinions and their passions.

"A republic, by which I mean a government in which the scheme of representation takes place, opens a different prospect and promises the cure for which we are seeking. Let us examine the points in which it varies from pure democracy, and we shall comprehend both the nature of the cure and the efficacy which it must derive from the Union.

"The two great points of difference between a democracy and a republic are: First, the delegation of the government, in the latter, to a small number of citizens elected by the rest; secondly, the greater number of citizens and greater sphere of country over which the latter may be extended.

"The effect of the first difference is, on the one hand, to refine and enlarge the public views, by passing them through the medium of a chosen body of citizens, whose wisdom may best discern the true interest of their country and whose patriotism and love of justice will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be least likely to sacrifice it to temporary or partial considerations. Under such a regulation, it may well happen that the public voice, pronounced by the representatives of the people, will be more consonant to the public good than if pronounced by the people themselves convened for the purpose."

Not only was the representative or republican form of government adopted for the nation, but the duty was imposed upon the Federal government to see that the governments of the several States were of like character.

The experience of one hundred and twenty years has demonstrated the wisdom of the action taken by our fathers. For the first time in the world's history, a government by the people has proved a success. Under the beneficent operation of the republican form of government, this nation has become great and foremost among the world's Powers for the uplifting of mankind.

The chief aim and purpose of a popular government is to give effect to the wishes of the people; but it is the sober and mature judgment of the people, and not their temporary impulses and passions, which should be the basis of legislation. The representative system, because of the opportunity which it affords for discussion and deliberation, is better calculated to ascertain the true views of a majority of the people than any other known method; and to this fact the permanence and prosperity of the nation are due. No large body of men can act *en masse* in the examination and determination of intricate and important questions. Special investigation by qualified persons is indispensable. Opportunity must be afforded to harmonize conflicting views and ascertain the real wishes of the majority. Time is also necessary to avoid the danger of being carried away by temporary impulses and passions. All these the representative system provides, and so generally is this fact recognized that its practice has become almost an instinct with the American people. It is universally resorted to in all political and social gatherings of men, whether large or small. Every club appoints its committees to frame its rules and order of procedure. Political conventions, municipal bodies and Legislatures, proceed in a similar manner. In no other way can the business of assemblies of men be effectively transacted.

The reason for the radical changes which are now being pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

posed is a wide-spread popular belief that legislators have been corrupt and have not reflected the people's will, and particularly that they have fallen under the domination of great corporations, which have used them to promote their own selfish interests. It is undoubtedly true that there has been reason for many of these charges—though, like all popular charges, they have frequently been exaggerated. But it is also true that the danger from such sources has practically passed, and no necessity for drastic and revolutionary remedies now exists. During the past few years a great moral awakening has spread over the land; and that greatest corrective, an enlightened public opinion, is rapidly suppressing the evils of which complaint has so long been made. It may also truly be said that these evils at their worst were mere excrescences upon the body politic, whose removal was required, rather than the destruction of the government itself.

But it is not true that our legislators have generally been corrupt or that they have failed to respond to the public demands. The most compelling force in any civilized community, and particularly in a country where the people choose their own rulers, is public opinion. Forms of government go down before it; and no system can long endure which ignores the rights or spurns the wishes of the people. For more than 120 years the representative form has been our only form of government. Under its benign influence, the country has prospered and grown great. Nowhere else on earth have the liberties of the people and their rights of property been so completely assured. To-day the world turns to the United States as the great moral power among nations. This could not be if our legislators were generally either unintelligent or corrupt.

But granting that evils and difficulties attend the operation of the representative system—which is inevitable in all human institutions—the substitution of the "Initiative" method would not afford the remedy.

In the first place, the "Initiative" method is undoubtedly unconstitutional.

The Constitution of the United States not only provides a representative form of government for the nation, but it guarantees a like form of government to the several States.

Article IV, Section 4, reads as follows:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion, and on the application of the Legislature or of the Executive, when the Legislature cannot be convened, against domestic violence."

The debates in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 clearly show that the term "republican" government was used to indicate a representative form of government, as distinguished from a democracy.*

Political and historical writers since that time have, without exception, attributed the same meaning to the term.

"History, then, establishes the fact that, in the American system of government, the people are regarded as the sole original source of all political authority; that all legitimate government must rest upon their will. But it also teaches that the will of the people is to be exercised through representative forms."†

"It is frequently forgotten that this government is not democratic in form or in substance; the difference being that in a democracy, the people as a mass have and may exercise political power. In a republic, while all power is derived from the great body of the people, they never in a single instance actually participate as a body in the administration of government. Representation is an essential feature of a republic; power must be delegated or lie dormant."‡

The opinion of the greatest jurists and the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States are to the same effect.

"But the authority extends no further than a guaranty of a republican form of government which supposes a pre-existing form of government of the form which is to be guaranteed. As long, therefore, as the existing republican forms are continued by the States, they are guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. Whenever States may choose to substitute other republican forms, they have a right to do so, and to claim the Federal guaranty for the latter. The only restriction imposed on them is that they shall not exchange republican for anti-republican Constitutions."¶

"The power of the people to amend or revise their Constitutions is limited by the Constitution of the United States in the following particulars:

"(1) It must not abolish the republican form of government, since such an act would be revolutionary in its character, and would call for

* See Madison's remarks, Elliott's Deb., 449. Hamilton's remarks, Elliott's Deb., 450. "The Federalist," 10th Essay by Madison.

† George Ticknor Curtis's "Constitutional History of the U. S.," Vol. I, Chap. 32.

‡ Andrew's "American Law," p. 191.*

¶ Story's "Commentaries," 5th Ed., Sec. 1,817.

* See also Webster's Works, Vol. VI, p. 217. Calhoun's Works, Vol. VI, p. 219.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and demand direct intervention on the part of the government of the United States."*

"The national Government, it should ever be remembered, is one of limited delegated powers and is not a pure democracy in which the will of a popular majority as expressed at the poll at a particular time becomes immediately the supreme law. It is a representative republic in which the will of the people is to be ascertained in a prescribed mode and carried into effect only by appointed agents designated by the people themselves in the manner indicated by law."†

In the second place, notwithstanding the pretensions of its advocates, the "Initiative" method is far from affording the people the promised opportunity of expressing and enforcing their views. On the contrary, it is a cunning and effective device for imposing upon the people the individual views of the proposer, and in such a specious and deceiving way as to delude the unthinking into the belief that they are acting for themselves. Whatever is proposed must be voted upon precisely as presented. If another individual has a different idea, however slight the difference may be, if his experience suggests some desirable modification, it must be embodied in a separate proposal and voted upon separately, and so on, *ad infinitum*. This is because the representative principle, which permits of discussion and modification of views, is wanting. The system to be workable presupposes such superhuman intelligence and honesty on the part of the proposer, and such diligence and discrimination on the part of the voter, as could only exist in the imagination of an idealist.

The opportunity which this method affords for fraud and the promoting of dishonest schemes is obvious, and it is not at all surprising to find included with the idealists and impractical reformers who are advocating this change a strong, though guarded, support from the practical machine politicians, who, feeling the effect of a wide-spread condemnation of their methods by an aroused people, realize they can no longer hope to maintain their influence or pursue their old practices in the halls of legislation, in the light of the publicity which is now being brought to bear upon them.

A further objection to the method is that it will greatly increase the number of elections, and it cannot reasonably be ex-

* Cooley's "Constitutional Limitations," 1st Ed., p. 33.
† Address by Justice Harlan in December, 1907.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pected that the average voter, who is so indifferent that he will not give attention to the selection of a proper representative to protect his rights, will assume the far greater burden of examining and intelligently acting upon the multitude of proposals which may be presented by the "Initiative" method.

The system of direct or primary nomination of candidates for office involves substantially the same principles as the "Initiative," and is open to the same objections. Its purpose, like that of the "Initiative," is to eliminate the feature of selection by a representative body, and to permit individuals to vote directly for candidates for office—the idea being that every one can have a voice in the selection, and thus the machinations of party politicians be defeated. This system has been adopted in many of the States; and in practice has led to some results quite different from what its advocates claim for it. It has become apparent that only seekers after office become candidates for nomination—the office no longer seeks the man. The system destroys all party organization. Political policies and principles are entirely lost sight of in the confusion of individual ideas. It affords no opportunity for consideration of the fitness of candidates. Each candidate, whether qualified or not, determines that question for himself.

Voters are limited in their choice to such persons as present themselves. If there are but two candidates, the one selected may be considered the choice of a majority of the people, as between the two; but it by no means follows that some one else would not have been more satisfactory than either if some better method of ascertaining the real wishes of the people were provided. If there are more than two candidates, as is usually the case, the almost inevitable result is that the candidate selected is the choice of but a minority of the party; and as candidates multiply, and the range of selection increases, a correspondingly reduced minority may foist upon the party a candidate who may be altogether objectionable to a large majority.

When the system is extended over a large territory and is used for the selection of candidates for the higher offices, it becomes practically impossible for the mass of voters to make any intelligent selection, while the opportunities for improper control of elections are far greater than under the convention system.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The cost of conducting a campaign for the higher offices, even if the expenses are confined to legitimate purposes, has proved to be so great that all but very wealthy men and those with powerful machines behind them are practically excluded.

The influence of the newspapers is also enormously increased, as they afford the only practical means of information respecting the qualifications of candidates for nomination. Possibly it is because of this fact that so few adverse criticisms of the system have appeared in the public press.

These defects and weaknesses are gradually becoming apparent as the system is put into actual operation, and after a time it will inevitably be condemned as heartily as it is now being commended.

No person should be nominated as a candidate of a party unless he is the choice of a majority of such party, and no method of nomination is sound which does not provide some means by which consideration of the merits of the different candidates can be had, so as to permit an intelligent selection to be made. Opportunity for comparison of the merits of candidates and for a choice by a majority is as vital in the selection of nominees to office as discussion, deliberation and determination by a majority are in the enacting of laws. This is possible only under the representative system.

The remedy for the evils attending the operation of the representative system is, not to destroy it, but to select better representatives. Under our present system, delegates to nominating conventions are selected at caucuses, more or less informally called. It frequently happens that vicious and corrupt elements secure control of them, and decent citizens are reluctant to take part in what sometimes prove to be unseemly contests. The great majority of the people, however, are decent, law-abiding citizens; and if they would bestir themselves and perform their civic duties there would be little cause for complaint. A small part of the vigilance and attention on their part which would be required to give any efficiency whatsoever to a system of "direct" legislation or nomination would insure the election of delegates who would truly represent them; but no system will protect the people against their own indifference.

HENRY M. CAMPBELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW CORPORATION TAX.

BY CHARLES A. CONANT.

In spite of the outcries in certain quarters, that the new tax proposed in Congress upon the net earnings of corporations is "socialistic" and "iniquitous," it is one of the most equitable and easily collected forms of taxation employed by modern states. The critic who calls it "socialistic" must either confess his ignorance of the legislation of the most conservative countries of Europe or must be prepared to contend that they have already been captured by the enemies of society. It is inevitable that there should be an outcry against any measure which touches the pocket nerve; but those who cry out against a rate of one or even two per cent. upon corporation earnings, after the deduction of operating cost, depreciation charges and interest on bonds, may well be set to studying the corporation and income taxes of Europe.

In Great Britain the income tax is classified according to sources of income, but the rate is varied according to the demands of the Treasury. As recently as 1902 the rate was 5.75 per cent., and in 1903, 6.15 per cent., and the amount taken from the pockets of the taxpayers was in excess of $175,000,000. In Prussia even incomes below $900 pay a small charge and those above that amount are subject to a progressive rate which rises to 4 per cent. In Austria the income tax includes a rate of 5 per cent. upon income derived from securities or from industrial and commercial operations.

In France business is subjected, apart from many other taxes, to a so-called patent tax, based upon the size of shops and number of employees, and there is an additional tax upon income from securities. The patent tax fell in 1903 upon 1,506,520 small establishments, which paid about $11,000,000 of the total revenue of $18,000,000, the remainder being derived from bankers, large

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

merchants and large manufacturing establishments. The tax upon the income of stocks and bonds, after having stood at 3 per cent. until 1890, was then advanced to 4 per cent., but this charge is augmented in the case of securities to bearer by a transfer tax of 4 cents for every $20 of the quoted value. The total deduction by taxation from the income of securities in France is estimated by Professor Leroy-Beaulieu at from 9 to 10 per cent., resulting in the case of railway bonds in the retention of about 32 cents by the Government upon every $3 in interest allotted. The revenue derived from this tax in 1904 rose considerably above $16,000,000. In Russia a still heavier burden was imposed by the law of 1898 upon the profits of stock companies by fixing a progressive rate, beginning at 3 per cent. where profits were not above 4 per cent. of capital, and rising to 6 per cent. upon profits reaching 10 per cent. of capital, with a still heavier charge where profits exceed 10 per cent.

It is not in the financial history of the conservative capitalistic countries of Europe, therefore, that the opponent of a moderate tax upon net earnings will find parallels hostile to such a tax in America. The amount of the share capital of joint-stock companies in the United States is now not less than $25,000,000,000, upon which earnings are probably close to $1,500,000,000. A levy of 1 per cent. upon this amount will bring into the public Treasury $15,000,000. This tax upon the great corporations of the country is almost infinitesimal in comparison with the burdens bravely borne during the Civil War. It is not to be contemplated that those taxes should be renewed, but the figures of the amounts collected afford an impressive indication of the ability of the country to raise revenue and the great diversity of sources from which it might be derived. In a letter of March 26th last to the Secretary of the Treasury, of which a copy was sent to President Taft, the writer made the following summary of conditions during the Civil War and at the present time:

"The population of the United States in 1866 was, according to the official estimates, 35,344,000, and the aggregate wealth of the country was about one-fourth of the amount at the present time. In spite of these conditions, the following were among the internal revenue taxes collected during the fiscal year 1866, when collections were at their maximum, because they were then first extended over the whole Union and the reduction of taxation had not begun:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Manufactures and products	$178,356,661
Licenses	18,038,098
Banks, etc.	12,109,420
Gross receipts	11,262,430

"These are only a part of special sources of revenue in 1866, amounting in the aggregate to $310,906,984. If collections of $15,815,000 from cigars and tobacco and $34,315,000 from distilled and fermented liquors are deducted from the total of $178,356,661 collected on manufactures, there will still remain from other classes of manufactures collections of more than $128,000,000, or at the ratio of about $350,000,000 for the present population, without allowing for increase in the ratio of wealth. If the manufacturing interests of the United States could survive in 1866 under taxes of $128,000,000, they would apparently suffer no detriment by the payment of $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 annually under present conditions, in view of the increase in protection which they now receive from tariff legislation."

There has been a striking absence of denunciation of the new tax from the ranks of those who are qualified to express an opinion on its merits as an economic principle. The reason is simple—that the principle of the tax is recognized everywhere as economically sound and that it lacks the conspicuous defects of the personal income tax in regard to facility of collection. A tax on net earnings is a tax upon capital which has been accumulated. It is not a tax upon capital in the making. In this respect it differs from all those taxes—like stamp taxes, stock-transfer taxes, duties on raw materials, and even licenses—which are taxes upon the transaction of business. It involves no enhancement of the prices of finished products by reason of the capital invested in taxes paid; no restriction of output because of charges upon sales or transfers; no hesitation as to whether to take advantage of a rise in security values by reason of taxes upon their purchase and sale. In these respects it meets the test of economic soundness at a point where such a measure as the tax upon transfers of stock, imposed a few years ago by the State of New York, conspicuously fails. The latter imposes a burden upon the free movement of titles to property, and works an economic evil greater than the amount of the burden, because it blunts the sensitiveness of the market as a register of values. Against these criticisms the tax on net incomes is immune.

That the tax is levied upon net incomes is much more equitable than if it were levied upon gross earnings or upon dividends only. Not only may there be large gross earnings without profit,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but in different classes of business the ratio differs greatly between gross earnings and net profits. The tax upon gross earnings would be likely to impose the heaviest burdens upon the corporation producing standard articles, upon which only a small profit was derived from a large turn-over, and relatively the smallest burden upon those corporations exploited by men of original ability who, by the production of novelties, were able to derive a large profit from a small turn-over. Gross earnings bear no definite or equitable relation to profits; net earnings are the exact measure of profit and of success. If no profits are earned, then the enterprise escapes taxation; if the profits are small, the tax is correspondingly small; if the profits are large, the tax falls lightly upon the amount which is available for distribution to shareholders.

The contention, that a tax upon corporations works injustice to their shareholders in competition with private partnerships, is not likely to be heard often from the lips of competent members of the bar who realize the privileges and benefits which the corporate form has conferred upon the individual in doing business. Much is due to the corporation in the creation of the modern mechanism of manufacture and transportation, but to pretend that the debt is due to the corporations themselves as benevolent entities is juggling with words to confuse muddled brains. The debt is due rather to those who devised this form and to the state, which under this form permits individuals to invest whatever sums they choose in corporate ventures without being liable for more than their investment. So great are the advantages of the uninterrupted life, the limited liability, and the divisible and transferable character of property which are the essential features of the modern corporation, that a tax of many times 2 per cent. upon net earnings would not compensate for them.

It is said that most of the corporations of the United States derive their life and privileges from the laws of the States and not from the law of the nation. Space can hardly be found in an article like this for discussing the purely legal aspects of this question. On the side of equity, however, it may fairly be contended that the Union is the representative of the States and that when the States severally formed the Union they secured for the citizens and corporations of each the privilege of trading in other States, now grown to forty-five in number and repre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

senting a field of commercial exploitation, free from tariff charges or other barriers, such as is open to the citizens and corporations of no other country. So complete has this freedom of intercourse become that the fact that it is a privilege has been forgotten. That the Government of the United States has the right to regulate commerce between the States is set forth in the Constitution. That this right might be exercised in some other way than the complete freedom of intercourse which now prevails was probably clearly in the minds of the founders of the Union. As late as 1866, the running of railway trains without interruption or stop at State boundaries was sanctioned by a special law. There is no doubt, therefore, that corporations as well as individuals derive privileges almost immeasurable from the protection and freedom accorded them by Federal law, by Federal courts, and by the very existence of the compact of union between the States. To insist that they should be free from contributions to carry on the Federal Government would be to erect them into a class possessing special privileges of a value which would make the privileges of the proconsuls of Rome or the *noblesse* of the *ancien régime* in France shrink in comparison to tawdry toys.

Most of the objections which have been conjured up against the new tax are little more than men of straw. The serviceable old bogey, "the widow-and-orphan" stockholder, behind which corporations have so often sought shelter, has been projected into the foreground, much as savages sometimes protect their lines from attack by putting forward their women prisoners. This objection falls to the ground with many others before the lightness of the burden which the tax involves. A corporation earning $1,000,000 above all the charges which the law allows to be deducted, would have just sufficient profits to pay a dividend of 10 per cent. on a capital of $10,000,000. But it must be borne in mind, in dealing with the ratio of the tax to volume of business, that net earnings of $1,000,000 would be likely to represent earnings above operating expenses of say $2,000,000 and gross income of perhaps $10,000,000. From such sums the tax of $10,000 at the rate of 1 per cent. would come, and if deducted from net earnings would reduce the balance to $990,000. In theory, the helpless widow would find her dividend cut from 10 per cent. to 9.9 per cent. But no sane corporation is run upon such a basis. It does not allot the last dollar of earnings in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dividends, and a charge of $10,000 upon an annual surplus of $1,000,000 is like many other charges—only an incident of corporation activities, like $10,000 spent for travelling expenses for the investigation of new openings for business, or for gratuities to employees. The widow who has her property invested in a corporation which distributes its earnings "up to the hilt," so that it cannot pay the tax without reducing its dividend, would better get out of her investment in the first "bull" market.

Equally puerile, in view of the facts, appear the suggestions that the tax will be evaded by turning stock into bonds, by diverting earnings into increased salaries, and by false returns. Undoubtedly these devices will occasionally be adopted, but it is insulting the intelligence of the average corporation board to believe that they will be adopted by any considerable number of them in order to escape a tax of one per cent. The corporation which turned stock into bonds, for such a purpose, without justification upon other grounds, would be inviting bankruptcy. The bond is a continuing obligation, whose charges must be met in lean years and fat years; the stock is only a divisional share of the property, upon which dividends may be suspended when they are not warranted by earnings. The corporation which with a light heart increased its bonded obligations to escape a tax would find itself in the hands of a receiver when its earnings shrunk in a period of business depression.

This device and such others as the keeping of fraudulent books and the making of false returns would involve risks and difficulties which would not be compensated by the saving viewed purely from its practical side. Heavy criminal penalties attached to false returns would not be risked in many cases in order to save —not the full tax, but the difference between the full tax and the false figures. In this case, as in many others, the disposition to break the law would be measured to some extent by the ratio of the tax. It is upon this well-known principle that the import duty upon diamonds is fixed at only ten per cent., because the inducement to smuggle at the risk of criminal penalties is much less potent with the average man than with a higher duty. The higher duty was tried in the tariff act of 1894, and the result was a shrinkage of avowed importations of cut diamonds and other stones from $4,511,395 in that year to $985,611 in 1897.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A corporation cannot be formed without a record under State authority. It usually has a domicile, a list of responsible officials, and in the majority of cases a visible plant. One of the first acts of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under such a law would probably be to request each State to transmit to him a list of its going corporations. There may be an effort to test the legality of the tax, but, barring this, the amount of the tax will probably be paid promptly by nine-tenths of the corporations involved, with or without protest, as soon as notice is received from the Federal Government. The tax-collecting powers of the Federal Government are so much more energetic and far-reaching than those of the States that the cases are likely to be few where payment is unwarrantably delayed after a *modus vivendi* in regard to disputed legal questions has been reached.

These considerations raise another, which was hinted at by Senator Root in his able defence of the corporation tax in the Senate. This is the advantage which will be afforded in obtaining uniform statistics of corporate capital and volume of business. In practically every European country definite statistical information regarding corporations is accessible. In this country no such statistics upon a complete scale have been compiled, because the data could only be obtained by searching the records of forty-six States. The balance-sheets of the railways and other corporations which are much in the public eye have been compiled, but local corporations, like water companies, interior steamship lines, mining companies and many other classes, have not been obtainable in complete form except through special inquiries by the Bureau of the Census or by trade publications. With information in hand in regard to all these corporations, and its proper classification for statistical purposes, the prediction of Mr. Root will be verified that, "The Government of the United States will take a great and a necessary step forward to the more efficient and creditable performance of the duties which it has undertaken and that are imposed upon it under our constitutional system."

A great advantage of the tax on net earnings which has not pertained to any previous Federal tax is its adaptability to changing conditions. In this respect it runs on all-fours with the English income tax, of which the rate can be changed from year to year, according to the requirements of the budget. The adapt-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ability of either of these taxes to this purpose is due to the fact that they are based upon the sound economic principle of imposing no charges upon business in the course of its transaction. For this reason the rate can be changed without disturbance to business and without such losses to the revenue as occur when importations are increased in order to escape pending increases of duties or when tobacco and whiskey are allowed to accumulate in warehouse in anticipation of a reduction in taxation. The power might be conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury to change the rate of taxation upon the net earnings of corporations to meet the requirements of the revenue, within some maximum limit (say, four per cent.); but if there is objection to vesting such power in an executive officer, the same object could be attained by the fixing of the rate each year by Congress in the deficiency bill which passes just before adjournment. The latest data would at that time be available for determining the deficit in other sources of taxation to be met from the tax on net earnings, and if any error were made in one year it could be corrected in the next.

The adoption of a tax capable of being varied from year to year in order to meet the condition of the budget would be in itself a fiscal reform of the first importance to the Federal Government. Up to the closing years of the last administration the Treasury was run and appropriations were made by Congress with only the most indifferent reference to the relation between income and outgo. A policy of more direct responsibility, on the part of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, and of greater correlation in the work of different committees of Congress, was suggested in the last annual report of Secretary Cortelyou, and the policies which he recommended have been largely put in operation by Congress and by Secretary Mac Veagh. The recent adoption of a balance-sheet which shows the real condition of the Treasury, after careful analysis of the subject by Assistant-Secretary Norton, is a long step towards a sane and orderly budget system, in which a method of taxation which can be adjusted to changing conditions will be an important factor. If the rate of the tax on corporate earnings is thus made the measure of the lavishness or the economy of the Government, the most powerful interests in the country will be enlisted in a direct manner on the side of honest, orderly and economical public finance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Perhaps the most serious objection made by the corporations to the new tax is that which commends it to the people. This is the power which is given to the Federal Government to make such investigations as are necessary to determine if the tax has been paid upon actual net earnings. This is the "inquisitorial" feature which involves a continuation of the policy inaugurated by the last administration of applying to business in the United States some of the restrictions which are applied to it in older civilized countries. It was said by Edward Atkinson, I believe, many years ago that the people of the United States were the most lightly taxed of any who could be called civilized. Whether this is still the fact or not, it comes near being the fact that the corporations and the business of individuals in the United States are the most lightly burdened by official supervision among the older civilized countries. Americans who resent "inquisitorial" methods in dealing with corporations should study a few pages of the corporation laws of Europe. Not to speak of the Continental countries, where the Government acts in some cases as the kindly guardian of the masses, the body of English law on the subject fills a small book.

A corporation in England cannot issue a prospectus which is not signed by every person who is named therein as a director or by his agent. What prospectuses of new companies shall contain is carefully defined, including the number of shares required as qualification of a director, the names and addresses of the venders of any property purchased or acquired by the company, the amount paid or payable as commission for subscribing or agreeing to subscribe for shares in the company, the dates and parties to every material contract and a reasonable time and place at which such a contract or a copy may be inspected, and full particulars of the nature and extent of the interest of every director in the promotion of the company. Whenever a company makes an allotment of shares it must file within one month with the public registrar a return of the allotments, with full particulars, and in the case of shares allotted for other considerations than cash a contract in writing constituting the title of the allottee to such allotment and particulars as to the consideration for which they have been allotted. If default is made in complying with these requirements every director, manager, secretary or other officer of the company who is knowingly a party to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

default shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £50 for every day during which the default continues.

If Great Britain, the most conservative country in the world and the one in which trade, apart from other Anglo-Saxon countries, is probably the most unfettered in the world, sees fit to impose restrictions like these upon invitations to the public to subscribe for securities, then at least the mouths should be stopped of those who, in ignorance of the facts, may be disposed to characterize rigid company regulation in the United States as socialistic and without precedent. On the contrary, the United States, if she determines to establish uniform regulation in behalf of the investor and shareholder, in place of the present haphazard and disjointed system of company management, will follow a path of precedent beaten wide and smooth.

The new plan for taxing net earnings bears as lightly as possible upon the corporations by permitting the acceptance of their own sworn statements where there is no reason to suspect fraud. Investigation by Government agents is authorized only where reasonable cause of suspicion arises. It would seem to be for the enlightened self-interest of the corporations, if they desire to postpone the evil day of minute official supervision, such as prevails in Europe, to comply so promptly, cordially and honestly with the new requirements as to obviate the necessity for further measures. President Taft, with the usual optimism of a man of high ideals, has given them the opportunity by the terms of the new project to prove their loyalty and good faith. But if his confidence should be disappointed he holds in the power of taxation and the supervision which is a reasonable incident to it a "big stick" which will ultimately, in his hands or those of his successors, reduce the organization and management of companies in the United States to the narrow confines to which they have been restricted in other settled capitalistic countries.

CHARLES A. CONANT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GERMAN HEGEMONY OF EUROPE.

BY ARCHIBALD R. COLQUHOUN.

WHEN Charlemagne, in his dream of a revived Roman Empire under a Teutonic dynasty, had himself crowned at Rome as Emperor of the Romans (on Christmas Day, A.D. 800) the German hegemony of Europe was placed beyond question for a time. Later on the fact that the nominally German head of the Holy Roman Empire held a court in which the Italian and Spanish elements predominated, and that the House of Habsburg (which assumed the Imperial headship of the Empire in the thirteenth century) became identified with Austrian rather than German influences, gradually altered the relative position of the Teutonic states and the importance of their peoples. Disorganized, divided into petty states, torn by internal jealousies, the German kingdoms and principalities fell easily before the armies of Napoleon, and when that wave of conquest receded, leaving Europe full of wrecks, the military state of Prussia was the natural centre round which the German states began to rally. Prussia was the creation of Frederick the Great, in whose footsteps followed closely the great master-spirit of the nineteenth century, Bismarck, who saw to what a pitch of power a strong, self-reliant and unscrupulous military state could rise at the psychological moment afforded by the moral and political upheavals of the first half of the nineteenth century. How German unity was secured need not be recapitulated here, but the successes of 1866 against Austria and of 1870 against the hereditary enemy were followed by a fiscal policy which started the whole of the German states on a path of rapid industrial and commercial development, and the intoxicating effect of both military organization and mercantile achievement during the past thirty years has culminated recently in signal diplomatic triumphs. No wonder that Germans see

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their star, so long obscured, in the ascendant over Europe, and that, not content with military power such as Europe has never before seen, they stretch out their hands also for the trident of Neptune.

There has always been one great Power in Europe dreaded by the others—regarded as a danger and a menace. Spain for a long time held this position. Her armies kept Italians, Germans and Netherlands in subjection. France, powerful both on land and sea, was the arbiter of fate in Europe in the time of the great Louis as well as in the short but meteoric Napoleonic period. The sea power of France was the nightmare of Great Britain, and a life-and-death struggle decided the issue. It is but a few years since the French fleet ceased to be the chief preoccupation of British sea policy. Great Britain during these periods has played a decreasing military part, and in the last century has become a purely naval power—a development which has placed definite limits on the possibility of her interference in continental politics. Nevertheless, her unquestioned naval supremacy since the time of the battle of Trafalgar has secured for her an extraordinary position and influence, and on that prestige the balance of power in Europe has largely depended for the last century.

The present century ushered in a new period, in which that naval supremacy which Britons had come to regard as their prerogative is to be called in question, and the startling nature of this change can only be fully realized in the light of the most recent developments, in which it has become clear that the chief Continental Powers are obliged to accept the hegemony of Germany. The circumstances which have contributed to this, beyond the rise of military efficiency and economic prosperity of Germany herself, are the defeat of Russia on land and sea and the military and naval decay of France. The world is only just beginning to appreciate what the Peace of Portsmouth signified. One of Bismarck's canons of diplomacy was a good understanding between Germany and Russia, for he realized that the Prussian-Polish frontier was the weak spot in the German Empire, but the necessity for keeping the peace with a strong rival has now been modified, and it is Russia, and not Germany, which now seeks to "keep the way open" between Petersburg and Berlin. Germany has simply to insist on the Bismarckian principles of "reliance on traditional dynastic friendships, on com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

munity of conservative monarchical instincts and on the absence of indigenous political divisions." The Russian Tsardom and bureaucracy are profoundly convinced of the necessity of seeking Prussian support for "conservative monarchical instincts." Friendship with Germany means for the Russian dynasty immunity from foreign attack and from inconvenient reminders of the need for "constitutional development" within. On the altar of this official friendship Russian liberalism—that puny infant—has been sacrificed. The Russian Poles must be made to feel that they are no better off than the Prussian Poles. The Russian autocracy has been made to understand that, as regards the Slav struggle for constitutional liberty, the Romanoffs and the Hohenzollerns—not to speak of the Habsburgs—are in the same boat and must sink or swim together. The triumph of the monarchical element is for the moment supreme. As an outlet for Russian ambition, which the *debâcle* in the Far East had turned once more in the direction of the Balkans, Central Asia and Persia are pointed out as fields where no conflicting German interests exist. Constantinople, the Mecca of Holy Russia, still dangles out of reach, but the Dardanelles question may be used as a makeweight to secure Russian adhesion to German designs. Bismarck said:

"We readily supported the policy of Russia in 1870 in order to release her from the limitations which the Treaty of Paris had imposed upon her in the Black Sea. These were unnatural, and the prohibition of free movement on her own coast could not be long endured by a Power like Russia, because it was a humiliation. Besides which it was not, and is not, to our interest to stand in the way of Russia turning her surplus forces towards the East. . . ."

In the recent Balkan crisis Russia blustered and her people were full of pan-Slav sentiment, but the Russian Government swallowed a German ultimatum and the people their Slav sympathies—and, however we may criticise, we cannot but feel that, in an era in which Might is Right, they took the only possible course.

France, the partner in that Dual alliance which was to hold Germany as in a vise, was equally incapable of action. Her guiding policy is the determination not to be drawn into a war at any hazard. The neglect of her navy, fully revealed in recent disclosures, has completed the disorganization of her forces. Her army is undermined with socialism and pacificism. Her politics

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are confused and corrupt. Her statesmen are unable to define a clear and steadfast policy for the simple reason that they have no force behind them—neither the driving power of a strong public opinion nor the necessary instruments of a well-organized state. It is at this hour of her weakness that France has made a friendship with her ancient enemy, but that friendship is (apart from her impotence) due more to the fact that causes of friction have been eliminated for the moment than to any service which either Power might render the other in case of war. Great Britain has no land force with which to aid France, and France has no navy with which to aid England. The *entente cordiale* is merely an expression of sympathy with each other in the teeth of a growing menace to both!

Italy is another Power who says, with the apothecary in "Romeo and Juliet": "My poverty and not my will consents," when the matter in question is the German hegemony of Europe. Italy is not blind to the dangers involved in the growth and consolidation of German interests—she watches with deepening apprehension the mountain passes held by Austria, the reinforcement of her garrisons on the open frontier and the consolidation of her footing on the Adriatic—but where else can she turn for allies? How can she afford to leave the Triple Alliance? She only achieved a united nationality within the last fifty years, and has still to struggle with religious and social questions. She is a poor nation and her geographical position is a weakness in itself, and all her hopes of future development depend on the good-will of her Austro-German allies and their policy in the Balkan peninsula. She was pacified, in the recent crisis, by the promise of "concessions," especially in the shape of a footing on the eastern coast of the Adriatic which she had long coveted. But Italy could not help herself—it was a case of Hobson's choice.

When one turns to Austria-Hungary one finds a more active element at work to secure German supremacy than the monarchical self-interest of the Russian bureaucracy, the decay of France or the weakness of Italy. Here there is a definite Slav *versus* Teuton question, a racial as well as a dynastic problem, and the entrance of the Heir-Apparent, through Baron Aehrenthal, into the arena of European politics has marked a distinct phase in both of these. The reign of the Emperor Francis Joseph has bridged a gulf in European affairs. He has watched the rise of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a new Germany under Prussian leadership and the gradual extinction of Austria as an active influence in Europe. Having secured some measure of peace within his domains and witnessed their entire exclusion from the purely German sphere, he devoted himself to internal organization and to the balancing of racial interests. His Empire, with its strange admixture of Slav, Magyar and Teuton, became the moderating force between Germany and Russia—Teuton and Slav. Bismarck desired friendship with Austria but placed little reliance on it, holding that the balance of advantage lay in a union with Russia, though "complete reliance could be placed upon the durability of neither union," and he differentiated between a defensive and an offensive alliance with Austria, one of the preconditions for the latter being a settlement of the future of Poland. He said:

"The Emperor Francis Joseph has an honorable nature, but the Austro-Hungarian ship of state is of so peculiar a construction that its oscillations to which the monarch must adapt his attitude on board can hardly be reckoned on in advance. The centrifugal influences of individual nationalities, the interlacing of the vital interests which Austria has simultaneously to represent towards Germany, Italy, the East and Poland, the ungovernableness of the Hungarian national spirit, and, above all, the incalculable way in which confessional influences cross political decisions, lay on every ally of Austria the duty of being prudent, and of not making the interests of its own subjects entirely dependent on Austrian policy. . . . If, however, the reaction of changing events and situations on the decisions of the Vienna cabinet is not permanently calculable, it is certainly open to every ally of Austria not to refrain absolutely from cultivating relations out of which other combinations may, in case of necessity, be developed."*

The new phase in Austro-German relations does not involve any departure, on the part of Germany, from the Bismarckian tradition of prudence where Austria is concerned, but it commits Austria far more than heretofore to the German alliance, and the internal policy of the Habsburg who will succeed Francis Joseph is apparently to be founded on the absolutist traditions, while the revival of "confessional influences" is intended to counterbalance "political decisions" unfavorable to the new school. Whereas Francis Joseph gave political and religious liberty to the Slavs, Franz Ferdinand supports clerical absolutism in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Bismarck had no opinion of "con-

* "Reflections and Reminiscences," pp., 380, 381.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fessors," but then he stood for militarism as opposed to clericalism. Franz Ferdinand hopes to unite the two. The Austro-Hungarian army, be it noted, has been reorganized and is in a state of training and efficiency almost equal, it is said, to that of Germany itself, and the martial spirit has been revived by the rapid and effective mobilization recently effected. Undoubtedly the final throwing of the Austrian weight into the German scale was due very largely to the ungovernable Magyar. The national aspirations of the Magyars, stopping nowhere short of complete and absolute independence of Austria, were for a time held in abeyance, when Francis Joseph had conceded all that he felt to be essential to Hungarian national pride without cutting his dominions sharply in two and thus endangering both. Unfortunately the Hungarian "lawyers and hussars," who, as Bismarck said, make up the audible portion of that nation, could not be contented with a victory short of unconditional surrender, and to achieve their end they invented a "Magyar state ideal," a shibboleth which demanded the adherence of all Hungarians to the Magyar tongue and the Magyar creed. To secure this they have consistently alienated the Slav and German elements in their population (over one-third of the whole), but as the political power is centred in their hands, and they are incomparably the most skilful Parliamentarians in the whole of the Habsburg domains, they have successfully defied both their King and their non-Magyar subjects. Their position, nevertheless, is a weak one. Surrounded by a sea of Slavs, without a seacoast, an agricultural country dependent on Austrian markets, they have not the elements of independent national existence, but are being driven by their anti-Slav policy to rely more and more upon Germany. The extraordinary resemblance between the Magyars and the Prussians, in their relations to subject Slav peoples, is too marked to be passed over. As the Prussians are trying to dragoon the Poles of their eastern provinces, so the Magyars are dragooning the Slovaks and Roumans. In character no two peoples could be more diverse than Prussians and Magyars, but circumstances have given them a bond of sympathy, and economic necessity may drive the weaker into closer relations. Were Austria to enter that Teutonic Customs Union which is one of the possibilities of the future, Hungary would be driven to make what terms she could.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The European situation at present, therefore, stands thus. There is a great centre block of Teutons, controlling together mobilized field forces amounting to over two millions, trained and armed on uniform lines, and possessing within their own borders all the materials for war. Austria and Germany are not only able to supply themselves with arms and armament, but are in a favorable position as regards food-supplies. Round this block are grouped certain satellite states. Roumania, though without official declaration, is understood to be pledged absolutely to Germany. Servia is an unwilling satellite. She can help no one—least of all herself. Bulgaria is doubtful, but she plays only for her own hand, and if the Austro-German alliance continues to dominate the Balkans Bulgaria will be found on the side of the big battalions. Russia has nothing to gain and everything to lose by a rupture with Germany which might be fatal to her Government. Even they, with an illimitable supply of human material to draw upon, could hardly survive any more defeats in the field, and Petersburg, undefended by a Baltic fleet, is absolutely at the mercy of Germany. France wants peace at any price, Italy is tied hand and foot, Spain is a negligible quantity.

The basis of this domination of Europe is the enormous military power of the Central European states, due to universal service and to the perfection of the military system. To this Germany is adding a fleet which, as the preamble to the German Navy League lays down, is to be "strong enough to make war with it seem to the strongest sea power to be a hazardous venture." On January 1st, 1900, the Kaiser said:

> "As my grandfather reorganized the army, so I shall reorganize my navy, without flinching and in the same way, so that it will stand on the same level as my army, and that with its help the German Empire shall reach the place which it has not yet attained."

That resolve has been, and is being, persistently carried out. It cannot be claimed that this fleet was needed by Germany to defend a coast line of which more than half lies in the Baltic and the rest is peculiarly inaccessible by reason of sand-banks. Moreover, what Power in its senses would invade so strong a military Power as Germany? Nor can the German fleet be intended to protect her colonies or her overseas commerce, since the German war-ships are notoriously incapable of carrying a supply of coal which would take them out of home waters. They

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are obviously intended for service in the North Sea alone, and their only possible objective is to cripple or destroy that fleet which is Great Britain's sole title to power. The efforts made by Germany within the past few years to build and equip a navy have been so phenomenal as to altogether preclude the idea of normal development, and it is certain that she has taken advantage of a period of national inertia, on the part of Britain, to push forward preparations which would be entirely purposeless if not directed against England. In whatever form the challenge may come it will come, sooner or later, if Britons do not bestir themselves, and the risks are incomparably greater for England than for Germany. A blow—even a partial one—to Britain's navy would shake her Empire to its foundations, but defeat of the German navy would be only a matter of men and money to Germany—rich in both. That her naval programme is part of her general scheme for securing the hegemony of Europe is shown by the development, under her fostering care, of a naval spirit in Austria where German propagandists have been busy starting a Navy League. Austria and Italy are both laying down "Dreadnoughts," and the former, at all events, would form part of the German naval force in any war.

This, then, is the end of the Hague discussions, the Peace proposals and all the talk about international brotherhood, which have occupied so large a place in the conferences of Europe for the last twenty years. Such aspirations of a humanity groaning under militarism are usually the prelude to some outbreak of war more deadly than ever, and at the present moment the tension is great. In the graphic words of Lord Rosebery: "There is a hush in Europe, a hush in which you may almost hear a leaf fall to the ground. . . . There never was in the history of the world so threatening and so overpowering a preparation for war."

The ethics of international diplomacy have been violated in the true spirit of Frederick the Great and of Bismarck, and in the regrouping of the Powers those considerations of racial or sentimental sympathy which in other periods have affected the history of Europe are replaced by reliance on *Machtpolitik*, the doctrine of force. We can none of us afford the luxury of indulgence in sympathy for subject races or oppressed nationalities. The interest of this struggle for America is not wholly academic. The emergence of Germany as a naval power creates a new competitor,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

especially in the South-American continent, both for trade and for political influence. The possibility of the collapse, or even the weakening, of Great Britain as a sea power would reopen a vast number of questions in which the United States is bound to take an interest, and which the relations between the two English-speaking peoples have removed from the sphere of controversy. But the interest of America in a possible naval struggle between Great Britain and Germany pales by the side of the enormous consequences to Europe with which such a conflict might be fraught. The peace which for one hundred years the supremacy of the British fleet has insured to European waters would be no longer secured, and the heel of Prussia would in truth be on the neck of Europe.

The greatest barrier in the way of the realization of the German dream of hegemony lies in the character of Prussia herself. The autocratic, monarchic principle for which Prussia stands is one which raises enemies in proportion to its own efficiency, and is therefore founded upon sand. The absence of moral sanction, the attempt to crush national instincts, the *régime* of mutual distrust among the Powers, all bring their own retribution. It may be that a saner, happier Germany may yet be founded among the people who for so many centuries were in the vanguard of culture and who gave Europe the masterpieces of music and philosophy. People say that this old Germany is dead, but perhaps it is only asleep. Certainly it is a new Germany which has turned Europe into an armed camp in its stretching after a power greater than the Cæsars knew—the hegemony of Europe and the supremacy of the sea as well.

ARCHIBALD R. COLQUHOUN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GERMAN NAVY AND ENGLAND.

BY A GERMAN NAVAL EXPERT.

It is little known in Germany, and probably not at all in other countries, that three decades before the first German Naval Act became valid a plan was already in existence for the formation of a Prussian navy. In 1873, soon after the German Empire was founded, this programme for the new Imperial navy was approved. It provided for the building of twenty-three battleships, twenty cruisers, six despatch boats, eighteen gunboats, twenty-eight torpedo-boats, etc. Its object was stated to be the protection of the German commerce and the defence of the German coasts. Germany's efforts, therefore, to possess an effective navy for the protection of her marine interests are by no means of a recent date; they are, moreover, absolutely free from aggressive motives. Adverse party conditions in the Imperial Diet brought it about that, during the next twenty-five years, no permanent practical results issued from these efforts. There was also a lack of men who knew how to transform the naval ideas of the German people into facts.

This changed under the reign of Emperor William II. The first Naval Act of 1898 was passed by the Diet, and now the execution in modern vessels of the naval programme of 1873 was assured at last. Like the original plan, the Act of 1898 was not based upon a comparison with the navies of other countries, but only tactical reasons, as well as reasons of organization, were decisive in fixing the number and types of the vessels. It provided for the building of a double squadron of ships of the line, in all nineteen battleships, twelve large and thirty small cruisers. The rapidly growing naval interests of the German Empire, however, had scarcely been taken into account, and it soon became evident that a navy must be built which would not only be able to make a blockade of the German coasts impossible, but prevent it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

altogether. The Spanish-American war, Fashoda, the South-African war, the unreasonable holding up of German mail-steamers and, finally, the extension of her colonial possessions in the years from 1898 to 1900 further awakened Germany to the fact that, under existing conditions, there was only one means of protecting her navigation and her colonies—viz., the possession of a battle fleet strong enough to render war with Germany so dangerous even for the most powerful adversary at sea that the latter's supremacy would be at stake. An attempt has been made in England to misrepresent this purely defensive object of the German Naval Act of 1900, and to attribute to it an aggressive tendency; the suggestion was that Germany intended to build a navy which would enable her to attack successfully the most powerful nations. Whoever has read Mahan intelligently knows that for such an undertaking against Great Britain's immense fleet a navy different from that provided for by the German Naval Act of 1900 would be necessary. The execution of this law, again conceived according to principles of tactics as well as of organization, will increase the number of vessels to thirty-eight battleships, fourteen large and thirty-eight small cruisers. For tactical reasons it was thought desirable to form two squadrons of eight vessels each, with two in reserve.

This naval programme is to be completely carried out by 1920. In fact, it has been and still is the first planned in Germany after the temporary modernization of the old naval plan (Act of 1898). The bills of 1906 and 1908, though on account of technical progress more costly, did not contain anything essentially new.

In 1906 only the six large cruisers for service abroad, which had already been included in the bill of 1900, but which the Diet then had refused to grant, were asked for. At that time the Government had demanded also seven small cruisers, which met with the same fate in the Diet, and the Government did not insist upon these later on. The original and now legally fixed number of vessels, however, has not been changed during the last nine years. Taking into consideration the irresistible progress in modern ship construction and in the efficiency of arms, it is only natural that the German navy should have steadily increased in quality. On the other hand, the course taken by England has largely contributed to this end. Germany, since the new period

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of shipbuilding, had for financial reasons, and in accordance with the dimensions of her shipyards, restricted herself as much as possible regarding the size of her battleships and cruisers, and in this respect had remained within the limit of what was absolutely necessary when compared with the navies of other countries. The building of the "Dreadnought," however, and the great display made in England regarding this vessel, rendered Germany's former attitude impossible. Other nations, too, were now compelled to build larger battleships.

It was, therefore, historically as well as materially incorrect when assertions were made in the English Parliament that Germany's shipbuilding policy had forced Great Britain to increase her navy. Germany, on the contrary, had waited longest of all the great sea powers in introducing the "Dreadnought" and "Invincible" type.

The object of the naval bill of 1908 was the elimination of a mistake in the Naval Act concerning the life of the battleships. The Government, when introducing the bill, had intended to legally establish a duration of twenty-five years, with the understanding that the substituting vessels would be ready for use at the end of those twenty-five years. The Diet, however, had thought this period to be meant for the *granting of the construction* of the substituting vessels, extending thus the real duration to about thirty years, since the exceeding five years would be necessary for the preparation of the plans and the building proper. In case the supposition of the Diet were to be accepted, the duration of the vessels had to be reduced from twenty-five to twenty years, and this reduction actually formed the contents of the supplementary law of 1908.

It so happened that quite a number of ships were built twenty years ago, the substitutes of which were or are due in 1908, 1909 and 1910. While formerly two battleships a year had been built, this number was consequently to be raised to three in the years mentioned.

The scaremongers in England saw in this a general acceleration of German shipbuilding and tried to prove thereby Germany's intention of wresting naval supremacy from Great Britain.

The following list, taken from the Naval Act, shows that the pace in naval construction will slow down again in Germany beginning with 1912:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Year.	Battleships to be built.	Large cruisers to be built.
1908	3	1
1909	3	1
1910	3	1
1911	3	1
1912	1	1
1913	1	1
1914	1	1
1915	1	1
1916	1	1
1917	1	1

That the German Government does not intend to put forth a new naval programme in 1912, as has been rumored in England, is evident from the definite statements made by the Imperial Chancellor and the Secretary of the German Navy in the Imperial Diet.

It cannot, then, be denied that a uniform and consistent spirit pervades the German Naval Act and its subsequent logical amendments, that its aim is to prevent wars rather than to win them. It well becomes a people which, in spite of military supremacy and many inducements and provocations to the contrary, has been for thirty-eight years the safeguard of peace to Europe.

Many foreign countries have long ago observed that Germany's extraordinary success in promptly supplying her navy with ships and crews is the logical outcome of her naval programme. It is, therefore, surprising, but none the less a fact, that such a recognition, on the part of England, is of but recent date and can be traced only from the time when Germany decided to build vessels of the "Dreadnought" type. Across the Channel the German Naval Act had until then been frequently called the "paper programme" of the German Admiralty. More recently, however, a complete change has taken place, and the strength of the German navy has been of late much overestimated and its development greatly exaggerated. During the naval debates in the House of Commons this spring assertions were made and views advanced which showed not only an astonishing lack of authentic information in England, but also a remarkable disregard of official German statements. It became evident then that much confusion exists in Great Britain regarding both the spirit of the German Naval Act and the fiscal and parliamentary conditions of the Empire, and furthermore that for party reasons facts were readily ignored.

Of this there can be no other interpretation. In London,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

during the sessions from March 17th to 20th, even from the Treasury Bench figures were cited regarding the future strength of the German navy, the attainment of which is absolutely excluded by the Naval Act.

This law, it must be remembered, is entirely public, and the execution of its annual provisions depends wholly upon the appropriations of the Imperial Diet passed in open session. The First Lord of the Admiralty based this year's naval bill providing for at least four battleships of the "Dreadnought" type, six protected cruisers and twenty torpedo-boat destroyers and, if possible, four additional large battleships upon the statement that a mistake had been made as to the capacity of the German shipyards and the possible or probable pace in shipbuilding. Germany, he asserted, could have ready for service in the spring of 1912 not thirteen "Dreadnoughts," as had been supposed, but more likely seventeen. Premier Asquith expressed himself similarly on this subject.

It is not at all of importance what the German shipyards are able to do, but what they are actually building and what will be performed by them in the near future. Former Imperial Chancellor Prince von Buelow and Secretary-of-the-Navy von Tirpitz both emphasized in the session of the Reichstag of March 29th that not seventeen large vessels, but only thirteen, will be built. This number, consisting of ten ships of the line and three armored cruisers, will, furthermore, not be ready for service in the spring, but only in the fall of 1912. Not a single vessel of the "Dreadnought" type has been completed in Germany at present. Until now only the battleships "Nassau," "Westfalen," "Rheinland" and "Posen" have been launched. "Nassau" and "Westfalen," the first German "Dreadnoughts," will not commence actual service until the fall of this year, the remaining two in the spring and fall, respectively, of 1910. The first German vessel of the "Invincible" type—viz., the large cruiser "von der Tann," was launched only on March 20th last. On slip are, furthermore, the three battleships, "Ersatz Oldenburg," "Ersatz Siegfried" and "Ersatz Beowulf," the large cruiser "G," and quite recently the battleship "Ersatz Frithjof"; the last named vessel in the Schichau yards at Danzig. The following list gives the programme for the building of the new battleships and the large cruisers, indicating also the number of "Dreadnoughts" and "Invincibles" possessed by Great Britain:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Time.	Germany. Ready for trial trips. Battleships.	Armored cruisers.	Total.	England. Ready. Battleships.	Armored cruisers.	Total.
1909						
Spring.....	..	..	..	4	3	7
Summer.....	..	..	..	4	3	7
Fall.....	2	..	2	4	3	7
Winter.....	2	..	2	6[1]	3	9
1910						
Spring.....	4	..	4	7	3	10
Summer.....	4	1	5	7	3	10
Fall.....	4	1	5	7	3	10
Winter.....	4	1	5	8[2]	4[3]	12
1911						
Spring.....	4	1	5	8	4	12
Summer.....	7[1]	2[1]	9	10[4]	4	14
Fall.....	7	2	9	12[5]	4	16
Winter.....	7	2	9	12	4	16
1912						
Spring.....	8[2]	3[2]	11	16[6]	4	20
Summer.....	8	3	11	16	4	20
Fall.....	8	3	11	16	4	20
Winter.....	10[3]	3	13	16	4	20

Germany.—[1] Including ships of appropriation, 1908. [2] *Id.*, 1909. [3] Including two ships of appropriation, 1909.

England.—[1] Including "St. Vincent," December, 1909, "Collingwood," February, 1910. [2] Including "Neptune," January, 1911. [3] "Indefatigable," February, 1911. [4] Including two ships of appropriation, 1909, to be ordered in July, 1909. [5] Including two ships of appropriation, 1909, to be ordered in November, 1909. [6] Including four ships to be begun, probably, on April 1, 1910.

The battleship "Ersatz Frithjof" and the large cruiser "H," which is not even on slip yet, formed a prominent part in the English debates. Rumor had it that their building was ordered before being legally authorized, and this was said to prove the alleged secret acceleration of the shipbuilding in Germany, contrary to the terms of the naval programme. Secretary-of-the-Navy von Tirpitz expressed himself in the Reichstag with complete candor and at length on this subject. He explained, without reserve, that the contract for the building of these two vessels had been promised to two private shipyards purely for commercial reasons in order to obtain lower prices. The actual conclusion of the contract, of course, could not take place until after the naval appropriations for this year had been passed by the Imperial Diet. The time for delivery is, consequently, to be counted only from April 1st of this year, and the vessels will, therefore, not be completed any sooner than if no preliminary agreement had been made at all.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The German authorities also expressed themselves freely on the question of disarmament. Prince von Buelow, on March 29th, declared again emphatically that Germany did not intend to compete with Great Britain's naval force, nor to accelerate the execution of the German naval programme beyond its legal terms. He then stated that up to the present time there was no basis, practicable and just to all nations, for the negotiations on the limitation of armaments. Also in this question, he said, Germany's attitude was solely determined by motives of peace and for humane reasons. If Germany, the Chancellor concluded, continued now her reserve concerning this question, this could not be considered either remarkable or unfriendly to other powers.

The German authorities have made, regarding shipbuilding and disarmament, statements as candid, explicit and, at the same time, as reassuring as it was possible to make and as any one could desire. Nevertheless, nervous discussions of both topics continue in England, and Germany is still frequently referred to as the sole cause for alarm. There remains nothing to do, then, for Germany but to hope that soon a reaction may set in concerning these absolutely unfounded views. Every Englishman should recognize that his country has nothing to fear at all from Germany, so long as no attacks are made upon her national dignity and her independence. The immense strength of the English naval forces will then recur to him, exceeding that of Germany three and a half times. In the spring of 1912, moreover, England will have suffered no material loss of this enormous superiority.

England, of course, will gradually have to become accustomed to the fact that in the future other nations, too, will guard their interests at sea more than they were wont to guard them during the last century. Not only Germany, but still more the United States, France (planning the creation of a navy far surpassing that of Germany), Japan, Italy, Austria and Russia, are quite justified in expanding their navies. They will render it in the future impossible for England to maintain her present supremacy over all other navies, and especially over the combined two next strongest ones.

"The Shipping World," a reliable periodical published in London, recently estimated the percentage of strength of the larger navies as follows:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

	1909.	1908.	1907.
Great Britain	41.9%	42.5%	42.4%
United States	14.9%	13.7%	13.8%
France	12.6%	12.6%	13.1%
Germany	12.1%[1]	12.7%	11.6%
Japan	8.0%	8.3%	9.1%
Italy	5.4%	5.2%	4.2%
Russia	5.1%	5.0%	5.8%

[1] The decline in Germany's share in 1909 is explained by the author's omitting the small armored coast cruisers of the "Siegfried" class, as for the most part they had approached the legal age limit.

On account of the enlargement of ship types which England herself has initiated, the costs for the building and preservation of vessels have risen more and more. This fact contributes greatly to the difficulty Great Britain is encountering in the maintenance of her present disproportionate, and therefore unnecessary, supremacy.

There can be no doubt, then, that all other nations put together are less to be blamed for the course matters have taken than England herself; and it must be considered neither correct nor fair to make Germany, and Germany alone, responsible for it. Taking into consideration the relative strength of the two countries, together with the present public excitement in England and the lessons English politics have taught during the last three centuries, it is Germany rather than Great Britain that is menaced. England is at present assembling 350 vessels on the River Thames. How, then, can Germany be called aggressive? England is the only country that is now able to attack Germany without risk to herself. Germany does not desire more,—nor has she ever intended to do more,—than to create such a risk. The navy, therefore, which she is building to serve this purpose can never justly be called an offensive, but only a defensive navy.

A GERMAN NAVAL EXPERT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

ART AND ARCHITECTURE.

MR. J. M. SIMPSON, the author of "A History of Architectural Development," being an Englishman, holds a brief for English Gothic, but he has not lost his head, and it is not wholly unpleasant to meet a reasonable defence of those low, cool, quiet cathedrals, as pale and unimpassioned as the Anglican liturgy. Certainly it is not worse to urge, like Professor Simpson, that it was merely common sense in the English masons to use many ribs in vaulting, and to cut and lay the intermediate stone with less painful care in consequence than to insist, like Professor Moore of Harvard, that only this work of a single moment, in a single spot, may be counted as Gothic at all. That is too like saying no one shall be called a woman except the Venus of Melos. No; as Stevenson said once: The world was made before the English language and seemingly on a different plan; we have all somehow to fit our words to the world. It is a pity that our author—let it be said in passing—is so reckless with his own words,* dropping accents at will, and to make up writing usually "Nôtre Dame"; fantastically transcribing contractions from his note-book on the finished page, such as "N. D. of Paris," and "Isle de France," and "simple four-tile" or "six-tile" vaults (p. 91). These oddities with some of spelling are worth noting solely because the book is so admirable; sound, compact, amazingly complete, within the moderate compass of three hundred and seventy-five pages, and not a little delightful. The only omission we note which we would not quite willingly have spared, is the point of Cistercian influence on Italian Gothic. It may be that since Professor Frothingham's articles are still

* "A History of Architectural Development." By J. M. Simpson. Vol. II. Mediæval. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

buried in an American review of sixteen years ago the author had not seen them, but it is just as likely that, being rather pressed toward the close of his book, he preferred to neglect what is, after all, a minor point in the history of Italian Gothic, having no great fancy for Cistercians. He lets himself have opinions about all sorts of things: landscapes, the temperament of races, the way churches should be built nowadays. Much of the reader's pleasure in the book springs from this life and play of opinion, and much more from the immensely decorative drawings, the author's own, which are not only pictorial and suggestive everywhere, but far clearer than the average, so that the eye singles out the point at once. Why should not more books imitate this point?

Professor Marquand's book* is a disappointment. It is unpedantic, detailed, long and very dull. It takes up practically the same matters twice or thrice and says nothing that the reader can remember afterwards. It is all fatally indisputable: why say it all, the reader wonders, and why say it so, when a pocket A B C volume would hold the whole? The impression it produces is that the author is what, in some walks of life, is called stale. Clergymen and athletes are liable to the same state. He is, in effect, overtrained and flat; he knows his matter well and wearily. The wise clergyman will close up his Bible and go fishing for a month with Marcus Aurelius in his pocket. The wise prize-fighter will break training; and the wise student will look far afield to another land and age for a while, after putting all his old lecture-notes into the fire. Professor Gardner's delightful book on Greek sculpture in this same series has shown how it is possible to be thorough, scholarly and yet full of the most vivid interest; and Professor Marquand has approved himself at other times no less delightful. He should have done more for his publishers, his audience and himself.

This volume of twenty-eight essays,† none of them very long, on a handful of Dutchmen of the seventeenth century, is rather un-

* "Greek Architecture." By Allan Marquand, Ph.D., L.H.D. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909.

† "Great Masters of Dutch and Flemish Painting." By Wilhelm Bode. Translated by Margaret L. Clarke. London: Duckworth & Co. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equal in its interest, but leaves an impression of more substance than the look of it promised. Dr. Bode knows his material well. Since he was a Teuton before he was a critic, he has never spoken more *con amore,* with more unction than here, where he may speak of Rembrandt. His interpretation of that essentially northern genius may not, indeed, be to every one's mind; it is itself Teutonic. "He does not lose himself in the infinite or seek his ideal outside man, but he discovers the divine in man himself and finds peace and calm in his own heart. A mysticism entirely peculiar to himself speaks to us." Is that the translator's fault alone, or is it possible that in Germany a good word can be so abused? Certainly mysticism as recognized anywhere else is precisely all that Dr. Bode denies, whether rightly or not, of Rembrandt, that darkened and troubled spirit, the converse in so many ways of Leonardo. The word stands for many things, but always in some sense for ultimate soul-satisfaction, for that quiet at the heart of things which the late G. F. Watts loved to paint, and satisfaction, though Rembrandt often painted it, we know, with all deference to Dr. Bode, that he never knew. Yet the critic, while he has not cared to dwell on Rembrandt's melancholy end, or the inequalities of his excellence, has given due weight to the intimacy of his genius, and his triumph in the struggle with things too high for him. He has taken pains to trace Rembrandt's influence in dealing with the other painters of his period; and this in part accounts for the reader's coming away with a great sense of something said. For the rest those essays are particularly interesting that touch on men little known or half-forgotten, like Hercules Segers, Adriæn Brouwer and Jan Vermeer of Delft. That rare and beautiful master, now much cried up by the elect, is of especial interest here because we possess in New York a masterpiec of his. That, to be sure, we have only discovered since, under the admirable direction of Mr. Roger Fry, the picture was cleaned; whereby the divine and incomparable color emerged from a muddy blur of gray into a blue that has the clarity of a jewel and the quality of a lacquer.

The rendering is, on the whole, so fluent and easy as to read like original work; twice only has the idiom betrayed the translator. On page 318 the designs for "carpets" would seem by the context to be for tapestry hangings; and "laws of line (-) and air perspective," on page 146, is not English, and is barely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recognizable as the familiar principles of linear and aerial perspective.

Again the translation (by Jessie Haynes) is intimate and individual. The writer himself speaks through it very happily. In these essays, which get a kind of unity from his passion for Donatello, Dr. Bode* moves on debatable ground with uncommon geniality and urbanity. The tone of controversy is here almost uniformly gracious, and it is therefore the sadder that he should have abandoned his own manner to throw a savage word at Milanesi. Where should we all be in Italian art without Gaetano Milanesi—his untiring researches, his profound historical insight, his *flair* for a five-hundred-years-forgotten fact? Dr. Bode has his enmities, too, in the *quattro-cento* and is less generous there. In distinguishing, for instance, the work of Donatello from that of Michelozzo, he seems to imply that this or that pulpit or tomb could not be by the latter because he could never have had the originality or the imagination to do anything so good, and then presently asserts that "it is impossible to credit him either with originality or imagination" because he never did anything which showed these qualities. This is hardly fair and hardly logical. In the same way the critic appropriates for Leonardo all of Verrocchio's most romantic work: not only the "Scipio" of the Louvre and some rather frantic compositions, which are all probably school pieces, but the very "Primavera" of the Bargello herself, d'Annunzio's "Lady of the Beautiful Hands." Maud Crutwell, however, without naming our present author in her discussion of Verrocchio, has already raised the cry against that celestial thief Leonardo.

The illustrations are absolutely the next things to having a set of fine photographs, and the book is full of interest and personal charm and delightful sentiment. If the author puts Desiderio da Settignano very high and dismisses Mino da Fiesole with a slighting word, if he claims a relief or a *statue* for the young Michael Angelo, and gathers up half the medals of Florence for Spinelli, these, after all, are matters of opinion and as opinion valuable. It is inconceivable that Dr. Bode should ever be really rash or ill advised. Whatever he says is pleasant to read, and

* "Florentine Sculpture of the Renaissance." By Wilhelm Bode. London: Methuen & Co. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"*Stilkritik*" is always fascinating; if this book is a little rambling, yet the stopping-places are all delightful.

A few months ago these pages held up Mr. Edward Hutton as furnishing an example of the way a fine old book should not be edited. In reprinting Crowe and Cavalcaselle—a work of necessity—Mr. Douglas has shown how the thing should be done. An immense deal of research among archives, a long period of travelling from gallery to gallery, must have gone to supply the notes in fine print, and the appendix, all too brief, on Andrea di Bartolo. Mr. Douglas is a tireless student and connoisseur, and that he has had good luck with his *finds* is more to the credit of his taste even than of his acumen. He was the first, it will be remembered, to fix the personality of Sassetta and to identify a number of his paintings, though Mr. Berenson has since made, in a sense, that enchanting painter peculiarly his own, what with his illuminating articles and his beautiful panel of S. Francis. Here, with this new figure of Andrea di Bartolo, Mr. Douglas reproduces two paintings, one very lovely. And as the other volumes of this series go on and we come to the Renaissance masters of Siena, doubtless he will fetch other treasures out of his storehouse, things new and old. The first half of the book* treats of the earlier and greater Sienese; the second half, dealing with the beginnings of painting in Umbria and the north of Italy, is of less interest except to the special student, but to him invaluable; and of equal value, to connoisseur and lay reader, is the tone of constant and patient study on the editor's part, and with this a becoming deference where he has to correct or contradict his text; and an even more becoming decency of speech where he has to rebuke other critics "infected," as the phrase goes, "with Florentinism," or supply the omissions and injustices of his authors in respect of Siena, the city of Mr. Douglas's especial devotion, the city to carry a phrase of his own rather out of its context—of a "hieratic sumptuousness."

Lectures delivered in the spring of 1903 are printed, after five years, too soon or too late. They have not yet a derived or

* "A History of Painting in Italy." By J. A. Crowe and G. B. Cavalcaselle. Edited by Langton Douglas. Volume III. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

historical value, and they have lost the sense of the moment. What a man has to say—indeed, what all mankind has to say—never changes really. But the way he says it varies every year. The names which would serve for illustration in the early years of this decade are now not forgotten nor yet glorified, but simply antiquated *démodés,* like the tunes at a class reunion of middle-aged men. This is the more noticed here* for the familiar, easy, colloquial tone, unbraced, not to say slipshod. It is the talk of the old Bohemian. He must have his fling at the Philistines and the Academy; he falls into the studio mood and the studio *argot.* The reader, if by chance also an old Bohemian, remembering that *la jeunesse n'a qu'un temps,* and that the generation in Bohemia have not a longer life than the leaves of the forest, may wonder if it is really the same word, may be sure it is not the same *argot,* as belongs to the youths addressed. Yet so much the worse for them if they cannot feel the fellowship and catch the notion and learn somehow the wisdom. For Mr. LaFarge is wiser, certainly, than any painter now living of Anglo-Saxon speech, just because he has not restricted himself to Anglo-Saxon ideals, which include, of course, Paris. He, perhaps alone among the men now painting, has steadfastly kept to his love and comprehension of the great Italians to whom some of the younger men are coming back at last. He has not forsaken even the primitives, and he has done more: he has learned of the East and of the Pacific; and though he does not prate, only drops a word here and there, he understands about beauty better than a psychologist, and presents it now and then at an exhibition in a drawing almost as well as an Oriental. These talks are full of suggestion: some of the best things are merely dropped and left, like the word at the opening of the Fifth Lecture on the relation of the form of man to all lineal composition, and the effect that special study of the human body has on particular painters.

MUSIC.

Mr. Gilman has all the requirements of an excellent biographer. He is, first of all, a writer of real distinction; he has what is very rare in these days—a style, and he uses English as only a student

* "The Higher Life in Art." By John LaFarge. New York: The McClure Company, 1908.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and a craftsman can. He has a wide knowledge of music and of several of the related arts, acute insight and ready sympathies, and must himself have the artistic temperament or he could not so thoroughly comprehend all that it means both of joy and deprivation to others. In addition, he adds what are rare complements to this endowment, tact, gentleness and wisdom. We could have chosen no one in America better fitted to write the authoritative biography of our greatest American composer.

In the present volume* Mr. Gilman has expanded and filled out his original short monograph which appeared in the "Living Masters of Music." The biographical portion is almost entirely new, and the musical and analytical chapters have been revised and enlarged. MacDowell stands before us in this biography in his habit as he lived. The incidents and anecdotes told are illustrative as well as amusing, and we see him blunt almost to *gaucherie* at times, awkward, shy, profound, impatient of non-essentials, undiplomatic, but without equivocation, and holding his convictions with a passion of sincerity; a lover of nature without parallel, perhaps, in the annals of musical history; a romanticist in the higher and not the cheaper meaning of the word. Especially valuable are the chapters of thoughtful and careful analysis of MacDowell's music. No one who studies and plays MacDowell can afford to overlook these. Especially interesting is it to find Mr. Gilman pointing out that the antecedents of MacDowell's music are not German nor French nor Italian, but that his inspiration comes from the stranger and more exotic springs of Celtic lands and of the far North. He worked always from an abundance of pregnant, beautiful and novel ideas fashioned into musical designs with unflagging skill and artistry.

If one make exceptions of pure speculative thought and high beauty, philosophy and poetry, the two things most worth reading about are scenery and genius. And of these two excellent matters Mr. Henry T. Finck's book about Grieg† are full to overflowing. The fjords and mountains, the beetling cliffs and waterfalls, the lofty peaks crowned by eternal snows, and the simple, hard-bred

* "Edward MacDowell." By Lawrence Gilman. New York: John Lane Company, 1909.

† "Grieg and his Music." By Henry T. Finck. New York: John Lane Company, 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mountain folk all took their own part in Grieg's Norwegian music, and there are traces of that northern isolation with its melancholy and mystical outlook upon life through all his compositions. The difference between the genius and the average man is that the common-or-garden man is shut up in his shell with his personal interests and affairs, while the genius has the roads of all the senses open for escape into the outer world. His connections with the universe at large are quicker and readier, and so he returns to his fellows with a gift of beauty and expansion. One feels this very strongly in reading Mr. Henry T. Finck's new Life of Grieg. This book, like the one referred to above, is a revised and much enlarged edition of the monograph that appeared in the "Living Masters of Music" series some years since. It is easy to see that Mr. Finck holds a brief for his subject. "The great must be great," he quotes from Grieg's own letters, "and a comparison with other great ones must always be unsatisfactory." Nothing so arouses Mr. Finck's indignation as the belittling of Grieg by some of the more advanced critics of the day. "His songs," says Mr. Finck, "are a mine of melody surpassed in wealth only by Schubert's, and that only because there are more of Schubert's. In originality of harmony and modulation he has only six equals: Bach, Schubert, Chopin, Schumann, Wagner and Liszt. In rhythmic invention and combination he is inexhaustible, and as orchestrator he ranks among the most fascinating." Perhaps one reason why Grieg is occasionally ranked low by the critics is because in a complex age he had a temperament of extreme clarity and transparence and retained to the end of his life a childlike simplicity. It is worth while here, however, to express resentment of Dr. Hanslick's description of the Peer Gynt music quoted apparently with approval by Mr. Finck. Anything more unlike the flood of broad, peaceful sunshine in the "Morgen" than Dr. Hanslick's description it would be difficult to find.

We have in Mr. Finck's book an excellent and authoritative biography. Grieg's music is of a kind to live and receive ever new analyses and interpretations. Doubtless much of it will be done, too, in America and by Americans, for we have, despite the efforts of Arthur Farwell and Henry F. Gilbert to translate popular melodies and Indian groans into music, no national product. Music is the latest of the arts to develop, and it would seem that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thus far all this young country can do is to analyze and criticise. In some less commercial age we may perhaps create.

This book* on orchestration is a useful book to keep on hand for reference. It contains much undiluted and unsifted information. It can hardly be said to be up to date when one notes the slim and offhand treatment it gives such modern composers as Charpentier, d'Indy and Debussy. The scores at the back, illustrative of the ever-increasing complexity and richness of orchestration, beginning, as they do, with Monteverde and Scarlatti and ending with Dvorak and Richard Strauss, are illuminating. A good many statements are made in a pragmatic and final form which any critic would be likely to call into question, and musical estimates are there in abundance which cannot be held in very high regard. Saint-Saëns, for example, that superbly unimaginative writer, is spoken of as the greatest orchestrator of France after Berlioz and the greatest living French composer. Very few people who know anything of music would echo this judgment, but to those who know little of the development of the modern orchestra much elementary information is conveyed.

A much more erudite and valuable book for the real student of music, despite its lack of pretensions, is Ebenezer Prout's "Instrumentation."† It is published in the music primer series. Although in the first instance it is intended for the student and composer, it is an excellent handbook for the ordinary concert-goer and will render the work of the orchestra and of the composer vastly more interesting and illuminating. It gives an exhaustive handling of the functions of the different instruments of the orchestra, together with good illustrations of the methods of the various composers and the trend of modern composition. There is a valuable chapter on balance of tone, contrast and color in orchestration, and several pages of score illustrative of the various orders used in writing for the full orchestra. The book is an excellent one to set on the music-shelf for reference beside Krebbiel's "How to Listen to Music."

* "The Evolution of Modern Orchestration." By L. A. Coerne. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909.

† "Instrumentation." By Ebenezer Prout. New York: Oliver Ditson Company, 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is once more a book to put on the shelf for reference rather than a book for reading.* It sketches the development of music from the first primitive attempts to the most recent orchestral works of this day. Necessarily the sketches are cursory and slight. There is no attempt at new or enlightened criticism of modern work, but all the well-known estimates are piously recorded. A most valuable part of the book is the bibliographical supplement and list of books on musical subjects given at the end. The book is meant for students and is a safe and conventional enough outline of the course of music in the last three and a half centuries.

In matters of taste, dispute is worse than futile, as the ancient adage points out; and if, therefore, we disagree with every position Mr. Lorenz takes up† as regards church music it is by no means to assert that his book might not have a value for others who would agree. He records with jubilation that "England sings our gospel and Sunday-school songs more generally than its own fine cathedral tunes." He seems to rejoice heartily that the lower product should have the wider spread. It is a thousand pities that America should not instead have adopted the cathedral hymns. His book is didactic in tone and gives much direction to ministers as to their musical obligations and duties. It covers the whole ground of the obligations of the minister, choir-master, choir, and we can only say that we should carefully avoid the church which should adopt it as a handbook.

FICTION.

After five years of silence, Mr. James Lane Allen has issued a short story which is a cross between a mystical and a realistic treatment of the marriage relation. Some dozen years ago Mr. Allen published in a preface to the "A summer in Arcady," a rather ill-judged indictment of the French realists aimed chiefly against Maupassant. The objection to that story was that Mr. Allen seemed to point out that sensuality within the pale of

* "The Study of the History of Music." By Edward Dickinson. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908.

† "Practical Church Music." By Edmund S. Lorenz. New York: Fleming Revell Company, 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

legality justified itself. It is a later phase of this same thought which he presents in the "Bride of the Mistletoe."*

It is the old question whether a forthright, sincere presentment of evil and analysis of its causes and results is or is not more wholesome than veiled excuses for it. The "Bride of the Mistletoe" is delicately and at times eloquently written, and the descriptions of Kentucky, the land of the author's birth and heart, are full of lovely vision.

It is a matter for wonder that Elizabethan plots have not more often been adapted to modern days and used. This Mr. Mills Young has done in "Chip."† The figure of the brave girl who in disguise as a boy accepts a position as overseer on a South-African plantation is charmingly drawn. The English misanthrope who is master of the plantation and whom she by degrees reforms, transforms and marries is a less agreeable character. The story is well written and full of fine description and has enough human nature to make it go.

The distinguishing quality of Mrs. Dudeney's writing is emotion.‡. She still writes with vehemence and vitality of human passion. Rachel Lorrian marries by mistake the wrong man. By a lucky chance there comes a time when she is free and might have married the supposedly right man, but alas! circumstances are complicated and she misses the opportunity. Rachel is clever, vivacious, epigrammatical, full of temperament, proud and unhappy. She is the type that by nature would furnish material for good drama. She is too difficult a blend of good and evil to make for a secure and pleasant domesticity and is justified by making an interesting if somewhat sad novel.

* "The Bride of the Mistletoe." By James Lane Allen. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908.

† "Chip." By F. E. Mills Young. New York: John Lane Company, 1909.

‡ "Rachel Lorrian." By Mrs. Henry Dudeney. New York: Duffield & Co., 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS

LONDON: ST. PETERSBURG.

LONDON, *July, 1909.*

THERE are three matters in which the British Labor Party is curiously out of touch with the public opinion of the country. I say "curiously," but I am not sure, after all, that the phenomenon is an exceptional one. It seems to be one of the fatalities of the democratic system of Government that the representatives of the people should always be more extreme than the people they profess to represent. One sees this discrepancy in France where a tranquil nation produces a particularly agitated kind of politics. One sees it in America where the most violent Protectionists are always to be found, not among the electorate, but in Congress. One sees it in Italy where the anti-clericalism of the deputies finds hardly any counterpart at all among the mass of voters. One sees it in Germany where the Social Democrats are far more the exaggeration than the condensation of the sentiments of the electors who return them to the Reichstag. And one is seeing it now in England where the people, as a whole, have certain strong and definite views about the Empire, about the navy and about foreign policy, and where the members of the Labor Party, which claims to be the only authentic voice of the masses, hold precisely opposite views.

The question, indeed, is likely before long to be sharply propounded whether, in such a country as England, a Party that separates itself at these three vital points from the determinating opinion of the country, has any stable and effective future before it. Rather more than three years ago, in the pages of this REVIEW, I ventured to hail the advent of the Labor Party as a wholesome sign. It showed that the working-classes were becoming conscious of their political power, were throwing off the domina-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of caste and social influence and were determined for the future to be represented in the national legislature by men of their own class who would vote with an exclusive regard for the interests of that class. The election of these extremely practical, business-like unrhetorical men, who had nothing in common with the agitating type of demagogue, nearly all of whom had earned their living by manual work for weekly wages and had risen in the confidence of their fellow workers, less through any gift of eloquence than by reason of their native shrewdness and capacity for organization and because their judgment, honesty and turn for affairs had been thoroughly tested by years of service on local councils and in the management of trades-unions and benevolent societies; and who entered upon their new sphere in a spirit of grim, hard-headed earnestness,—would prove, one hoped, a stimulating addition to Parliamentary knowledge and efficiency. The hope has not been disappointed. Both the House and the country have benefited by their acquaintance with the realities of the people's life. They have brought a new vigor and sincerity into the somewhat languid and overelegant atmosphere of English politics. "In most instances," said the "Spectator" of July 3rd, "the part they have played in the House of Commons has been creditable to their good sense, their political knowledge and their acquaintance with Constitutional methods. They have shown themselves to be good speakers and patient listeners. They have preferred argument to noise, and been more anxious to convince opponents than to obstruct business. They have in some cases given a useful lesson to the older organizations, and proved that a Labor Party can be a valuable addition to the forces which make up representative government." I heartily endorse that estimate. The Labor men, like other parties, have their own particular limitations and extravagances; they are often apt to be singularly ignorant of the national life outside their own narrow section; their policies are sometimes those of visionaries in a hurry; and they have encouraged schemes which to most Englishmen have seemed wrong-headed and demoralizing. Nevertheless, their presence in the House has made, on the whole, for national efficiency and for a juster valuation of the really important things in politics and society; and there are few Englishmen who would not feel it a loss to their country if their strength were to be broken at the polls. If Parliament

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has done something to educate and broaden them, it is not less true that they have done a good deal to educate and broaden Parliament.

It is, therefore, all the more regrettable that on Imperial and foreign problems and the naval and military questions involved in them, the Labor Party should place itself squarely athwart the current of national will. It is regrettable, but, perhaps, not unnatural. When one remembers the origin, education and opportunities of most of the members of the party, one cannot be surprised that they should be destitute of anything in the nature of an historical consciousness and with little or no appreciation of what Great Britain stands for, and has always stood for, in the scheme of *Weltpolitik*. Confronted by the problems of Europe and the Empire, their habitual sanity seems to desert them. They discuss them with a curious schoolboyish mixture of pedantry and illusions. Having little experience of the complexity of affairs, they also are without an eye for the facts of international life. They sometimes talk as though the world never existed before they were born and as though it were transformed when they entered the House of Commons. They are inevitably ignorant of foreign lands and languages; and instead of endeavoring to acquire merit by knowledge, they prefer to bemuse themselves with dreams of "the solidarity of Labor," universal brotherhood, an age of peace and all the other will-o'-the-wisps that have lured nations to their ruin since history began. Of the forces and conditions that actually govern events they know nothing and will learn nothing. The British people have a strong sense of Empire; common sense has taught them what is possible and what is not possible in the conduct of foreign policy; and the preservation of an irresistible supremacy at sea is, perhaps, their deepest political instinct. But the Labor M.P.'s hardly ever mention the self-governing portions of the Empire, except to deride the policy of Imperial preference. In Egypt and India they abet every agitation and foment every source of trouble and unrest, bringing to the problems of these dependencies no local knowledge, no imagination, an unappeasable faith in the virtues of the democratic idea and a conviction that they ought to be governed as Yorkshire is governed. Their foreign policy is a reminiscence of the worst days of British censoriousness, insularity and breakneck sentiment; while their distorted perspective makes them suspicious of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all armaments and incredulous of the inexorable need of national security. I think it fairly safe to say that is an impossible equipment for continuous political leadership among such a people as the British. Sooner or later it will bring the Labor Party clattering to the ground.

There could not be a better proof of the unfitness of the Labor leaders to share in framing national policy or of their remoteness from public opinion than the manifesto they have thought well to issue denouncing the visit of the Tsar to these shores. The political folly of it, in the light of Anglo-Russian relations during the past sixty years, is indeed almost incredible. For the best part of the nineteenth century Great Britain and Russia confronted each other in postures of scowling ill-will. Their relations were poisoned by a seemingly ineradicable suspiciousness. The two Powers appeared unable to come together and soberly examine and compare their mutual interests. A drifting inconclusiveness marked all their dealings. There was talk from time to time about "backing the wrong horse," about regarding Anglo-Russian antagonism as "the superstition of an antiquated diplomacy," about there being "room enough" in Asia for both, and so forth. But until the last year or two nothing was done to formulate the relations of the two peoples and the two Governments on a sane, consistent and stable basis. Now, however, both Powers have reached the point of reconciliation. Both realize to-day that neither gained by an estrangement that had endured for two whole generations, and that their enmity and its resultant deadlock were mutually unprofitable and barren. Both realize that each needs the weight of the other if the balance of European power is to be preserved. After long years of irrational jealousy, dislike, misunderstanding, offensive preparations and veiled war, it has been borne in upon the two Powers that each can be useful to the other, and that self-interest of the most peremptory character counsels harmony and co-operation. These conclusions were embodied in a formal Agreement some twenty months ago. They were confirmed by the meeting between King Edward and the Tsar in June, 1908. They are strengthened and endorsed anew by the presence in England of a large number of members of the Duma, by the hearty welcome they have everywhere received and by the forthcoming visit of the Emperor himself. None but the happiest results have flowed from the new *entente*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But for it the Persian question would be to-day not a local, but an international, issue of the gravest urgency and the most acrimonious possibilities. But for it Lord Morley could not have left the northwest frontier out of his calculations in dealing with the troubles in India. But for it Russia, in the long period of financial, political and material rehabilitation that lies ahead of her, would not be assured of the friendship of the Power whose Empire marches for thousands of miles with her own, whose wealth makes her the financial centre of the world and whose navy is still the mainstay of European peace.

Yet it is at this juncture and in these circumstances that the Labor Party, in language equally coarse and puerile, attacks the Russian Government as one that "is maintained by a system of murder" and by "hangmen, spies and blackguards of every kind," and declares it to be "an insult to our national good fame and to our self-respect" that the King should receive the head of the Russian state, "especially when his personal approval of the criminal agents has been placed beyond question." The manifesto containing these words is not a chance or unofficial ebullition. It is not to be compared with the outburst of one of the Labor members who, in the House of Commons, characterized the Tsar as "an inhuman brute" or with that of another Labor M.P. who declared that it would be a good thing for Russia if the Tsar never returned from his visit. It is not an effusion produced in a moment of excitement by this or that individual; on the contrary, it represents the matured and collective wisdom of the whole Labor Party and was composed by, and issued in the name of, its Executive Committee. Its origin, therefore, gives it a significance which its contents, I am afraid, would scarcely command. For anybody can see that the manifesto, so far as it is not the vulgarity of mere personal abuse, rests upon a theory of foreign policy that is altogether at variance with the practice of civilized Powers. The theory is that the British Government should abstain from all acts of courtesy towards another country whose domestic institutions or policies fail to reach the British standard of liberalism.

The Labor Party, apparently, regard it as an act of treachery to the cause of freedom that any monarch or Government should countenance the Tsardom. Theoretically they do not object to the improvement in Anglo-Russian relations, but they evidently

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hold it to be quite compatible with a policy of insulting and boycotting the Tsar. They attempt to draw a distinction between the Russian Emperor and the Russian people, a distinction which the members of the Duma who are now in England have been quick to repudiate; and they are fantastically blind to the elementary realities of the situation not only in Russia, but throughout Europe. As though British influence, so far as it had any effect at all on Russia's internal development, would not make for freedom and liberalism. As though the inevitable result of cold-shouldering the Tsar would not be to throw him into the arms of the Reactionaries, both in Russia and outside it. As though the Tsar, by any process of sane reasoning, could be held personally responsible for the blunders and bloodshed that have attended the Russian as they have attended all revolutions. As though the members of the Labor Party were in any way fitted to set up as the universal schoolmaster, to apportion praise and blame and to determine the rights and wrongs of a convulsion as complex as any in history.

The British people, I need hardly say, reject such views as preposterous. They do not in the least agree that the progress of Russia towards a more responsible system of Government can be in any way hindered by the development of Anglo-Russian friendship. They see, on the contrary, many ways in which such a friendship is likely to forward it. They know well enough—what the Labor Party is apparently unable to grasp—that the alternative to an Anglo-Russian *entente* is the strengthening of the many bonds that unite the Romanoffs and the Hohenzollerns; and they do not for one moment believe that, from the standpoint of Russian liberties, the influence of King Edward would be reactionary and the influence of the Kaiser on the side of freedom and constitutionalism. They see, in short, that to adopt the policy of the Labor Party is to play into the hands of those who, both in and out of Russia, are longing and working for the return of absolutism. All that is rational in British and Russian opinion not only welcomes the political *rapprochement* between London and St. Petersburg, but is delighted to see it expressed in a personal meeting of the two Sovereigns. The ignorance and hectoring arrogance of the Labor Party's manifesto have awakened nothing but a strong distrust of that party's capacity for sober politics.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ST. PETERSBURG, *July, 1909.*

IT is a noteworthy fact, suggestive and prophetic of much, that the leaders of Russia to-day should be the monarchists or Conservatives, who three short years ago fled before the revolutionists like sheep scattered by hungry wolves. In the first Duma, their voices were not heard. Even the thin, shrill utterances from the ministerial bench were drowned by thunderous shouts of execration. In the second parliament also their influence was hardly felt. Nor did they begin to count as a force in the regenerated Empire until M. Stolypin had framed his new franchise law, manipulated the elections and gathered together a following which, devoid of roots in the country, is bound to himself by every tie that can link a political party with a statesman in power. For the Octobrists represent no great political principle, strive after no lofty ideals, advocate no far-reaching reforms. They merely satisfy the Premier's need of a parliamentary majority and form a bridge over which he passes at will from the Conservative to the Progressist camp.

Hence on the one hand as spokesmen of the nation they from time to time respectfully remind the Government that it would be well to realize as soon as convenient such of the promised reforms as it deems opportune; while on the other hand as "Stolypin's men" they loyally set expediency before theory and vote solid for the Premier. This rôle of parliamentary myrmidons who are denied the luxury of having decided opinions on burning topics, was sufficient to account for their existence, but inadequate to justify their self-respect. Hence they sought in nationalism and militarism the sources of popularity which were denied them in politics. The army and navy found in the Octobrists eloquent defenders, enlightened reformers and generous patrons. Money for the needs of the troops was voted ungrudgingly; reforms proposed by the Ministry were carried with enthusiasm, and so closely did the Octobrists take to heart everything that bore upon the welfare of the soldiers and the bluejackets that they had a special committee of national defence created, set themselves to study the organization of the land and sea forces and began gently to modify that. They forgot that in matters of this nature to meddle was to mar.

This was the ground on which the Conservatives met, assailed and defeated them. The Tsar having decided to create a new

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

naval institution to which he gave the name of the Naval General Staff, asked his Premier to go to the Duma for the requisite funds. M. Stolypin accordingly brought in a bill by which the legislature not only provided the money, but also scrutinized the organization of the staff and subsequently even modified certain dispositions made by the Tsar and his military advisers. And in this the Duma deputies perceived nothing unwonted. But the encroachment on the monarch's prerogatives was denounced in the upper Chamber, which then threw out the bill. The Premier, however, having quieted the Tsar's misgivings, obtained his authorization to bring it in a second time and vigorously to push it through. And the manœuvre succeeded. The bill was carried readily enough by the Octobrists in the Duma, but it encountered fierce opposition in the Council of the Empire.

Here M. Stolypin's zeal would appear to have outrun his discretion. Confronted with statutes alleged to be irreconcilable with his bill, he confessed what he had formerly denied, that the question was open to discussion and that he might perhaps be wrong, but none the less adjured members of the Council to vote for it now and stipulated that he would harmonize the statutes afterward. He went further and besought waverers to yield to the monarch's person the fidelity which they would have fain reserved for monarchist principles. And making a supreme effort he carried the measure by a slight majority formed by the members of his Cabinet. Then he breathed freely, for nothing now was lacking but the monarch's sanction.

But the Conservatives refused to avow themselves beaten even then. Passion ran higher than before. The combatants on both sides forgot the conditions of the strife and the usages of parliamentary warfare. And if we consider how unprecedented the struggle was, this forgetfulness will cease to surprise us. Monarchists were doing battle for monarchism, yet were pitted against the monarch and his Government. Some of them, who had been seduced from their allegiance to principles in the name of their allegiance to the Tsar, were already repentant. Others who had remained steadfast were minded to drop out of the ranks and give up the cause for lost if the bill received the imperial sanction. In the opposite camp the Premier and several of his colleagues were prepared to resign in a body if the Emperor declined to affix his signature to the bill that whittled away some of his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prerogatives. At this conjuncture a truce was called during the convalescence of the Premier, who took a holiday in the Crimea.

On M. Stolypin's return to St. Petersburg, the contest broke out anew. This time, however, the tug of war was short, sharp and decisive. Perceiving how slender his chances were of moving the Tsar by suasion, the Premier put his faith in powerful pressure. He let it be known that most of his colleagues would imitate French and British ministers, draw their shoulders from under the mountain of responsibility they were bearing and let the Tsar find other caryatides to support it. And unquestionably this seemed a very forcible argument, for what it came to when all its terms were expressed was that M. Stolypin and his friends were indispensable, and as no tolerable substitutes could be found for them just then the business of the Empire would get sadly out of gear. And it is fair to say that this view was shared by many close and competent observers.

But the Tsar thwarted the tactics which, seemingly effective, proved harmful only to those who adopted them. He himself indited a letter to M. Stolypin somewhat to this effect. "Since our last conversation on the subject of the Naval Staff bill, I have given the matter my earnest consideration and am resolved not to sanction it. At the same time I cannot admit that you should resign in consequence and still less that a number of Ministers should withdraw in a body. We are not living in a parliamentary country, nor in Finland. We are in Russia where Ministers may resign only with the consent of the Tsar. And I have not requested you to quit your post." And what the Emperor wrote was absolutely correct. Russian Ministers may be likened to soldiers on guard or officers on active service during a war—they may not quit their posts until relieved. And they are aware of this. M. Abazza once tendered his resignation to Alexander III, who had the knack of keeping all his Ministers at a respectful distance. Turning his large, searching eyes upon the bold official, the Emperor answered that in the Russian Empire no one may receive or lay down a ministerial portfolio without the command of his imperial master. Abazza, feeling crushed, left the presence. A few weeks later the Minister was suddenly relieved of his functions.

M. Stolypin was stung to the quick by the Tsar's letter, which implied that the Premier misunderstood the relations between

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

monarch and minister as completely as he had misjudged the functions of the Duma and the prerogatives of the crown. And it connoted with unmistakable clearness that the authority as well as the prestige of the Premier was seriously impaired. But what galled him more than this was an imperial behest which intensified the significance of the Tsar's refusal to sanction the bill. The Prime Minister was directed to study conjointly with the Ministers of War and the Marine the Fundamental Laws, for the purpose of drawing once for all a line between the naval and military matters in which the Duma has a say and those which the monarch alone is competent to settle. And it was self-evident that this authoritative interpretation, which will be submitted to the Cabinet, must exclude from the jurisdiction of the Duma all such matters as the Naval General Staff bill. Thus not only was the Premier disavowed, but he was obliged publicly and solemnly to disavow his colleagues and himself. And this was the spot where the shoe pinched most painfully.

But M. Stolypin found no way out of the difficulty. Accordingly he resigned himself to continue in harness under the new conditions which his friends consider irksome and humiliating. He summoned a Cabinet Council to discuss the situation and do what was possible to save their face or the remaining features of it. Each member received the Emperor's letter to read and copy and some of them freely use it as evidence of the *force majeure* which, depriving them of free choice, also relieves them of moral responsibility for a line of action which they still vehemently condemn.

In the course of their deliberations the Ministers agreed that if they remained in office, it could only be on such conditions as in their opinion would enable them to work with benefit for Tsar and fatherland. They must, for instance, have a public expression of confidence from the Tsar, for if in theory his personal approval be enough for them, in this particular case a manifestation of it would be necessary. They then elaborated a draft rescript in which the Emperor was to identify himself with the general policy of his Premier. This document having been laid before him by M. Stolypin, was duly signed and published. Altogether the monarch and his chief adviser appear to have had a most touching interview. The Emperor, say the Premier's friends, moved to tears, broke down utterly at the idea of parting with his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trusty Premier and his words were punctuated with sobs. He used terms of tender affection, which no human creature with a heart could withstand. And M. Stolypin became plastic as molten wax and was literally fascinated by the Emperor, who was superlatively generous. Thus the Minister who kept practical matters well in view, readily obtained permission to fine the extreme monarchical journal *"Russkoye Znamya"* fifteen hundred dollars for a virulent attack upon himself. He also asked and received oral permission to take the President of the Council of the Empire to task for nominating candidates to the upper Chamber without the Premier's consent or knowledge. Altogether the solace he experienced was proportionate to the chagrin he had suffered and he returned to his palace on Yelaghin Island soothed and satisfied.

But thenceforth he was a transfigured Premier. Theretofore a progressist whom reactionaries anathematized, monarchists condemned and democrats felt bound to defend, he now approached so near to the ranks of the Loyalists that his own party, obeying a headstrong impulse, broke away from his lead, threw out one of his bills and wholly metamorphosed another. For example, it had been well understood that M. Stolypin would support the Religious Toleration bill as the Duma modified it, allowing every Church to preach, persuade and make converts and permitting every citizen to change his creed according to his conscience even though he should quit the Orthodox Church for the synagogue, the mosque or the Buddhist temple. But these concessions the Premier rejected in a casuistic speech, which his former enemies applauded and his former friends deplored. He also accepted in principle a bill brought in by the Conservatives to change the electoral franchise in nine western provinces in such a manner that the Poles should have Polish representatives in the upper Chamber and the Russians Russian representatives. At this point some of his stalwart supporters, like Prince Obolensky, turned away from him on the ground that the bill contained lethal germs calculated to bring about the disruption of the Empire. The Premier, however, stuck to his guns until his own party cajoled him into accepting a compromise which was a negation of the principle underlying the bill. Thus since the April crisis M. Stolypin's constructive influence, which was never either powerful or creative, has been perceptibly on the wane. He has cut his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moorings on one shore and has not yet contrived to reach the opposite shore.

As there is a curious lack of preparation in the public mind of America and Europe for almost every change that is impending in Russia, it will not be amiss to predict the advent of a strong monarchical Government, clear signs of which may be looked for toward the close of this year. The Tsar will then be, is in fact already, the central figure in the Empire. It would be rash to assume that love of power for himself or his successors is the mainspring of the rigorously moderating influence which he is now putting forth. That he is capable of making a heroic sacrifice in this direction was shown by the historic act of October, 1905. He is moved rather by a lofty sense of what he believes to be his duty to his people. It is not a whim to keep the nation in leading-strings that actuates him, but a desire to preserve the old landmarks for its guidance and to repair the wall that stands at the edge of the precipice for its protection. A state, like an individual, he holds, should be healthy and well balanced, and this condition presupposes a certain harmony of functions which he is now eager to establish. Possessing an ideal sense of the past, he associates the state and its acts with a religious sanction; hence to a new type of political organism, for which the elements are lacking in Russia, he prefers a series of correctives for the old one which is the result of gradual growth. Experience has convinced him that the break-up of the autocracy would be the break-up of the monarchy, the disintegration of the Empire and the inrush of anarchy. It may well be that the divine origin of absolute monarchy is an untenable legend, but none the less belief in its virtue to hold together the component parts of the great political structure is still reasonable and salutary. Such, in brief, is the systematic conception that lies at the root of the Tsar's domestic policy, of which we are likely to hear a good deal more next winter.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

Snakes.

We do not pretend to be able to prove that ours was the first snake; older peoples have had their makers of mischief and now, in common with ourselves, are suffering the penalties incurred through the indiscreet conduct of their heedless ancestors. The accounts of creation and the fall of man passed down through successive generations of Etruscans, Babylonians, Phœnicians and Aryans are quite similar to our own as presented in Genesis. That of the Persians, indeed, is substantially identical. The first couple were living happily without neighbors or other causes of discontent when an evil demon, sent by Ahriman, prince of devils, took the form of a serpent, gave to them fruit of a wonderful tree, which imparted immortality and so made it necessary for them to go to work to provide for the needs of a growing family. Even before this happened, according to the Brahmins, Rahn, "more subtle than the beasts of the fields," had induced Adea Suktee, "the first woman," to partake of the forbidden Soma and to give some to Adima, her husband, with the usual results.

But these are legends. The only authenticated account with which we are familiar is the Chaldean, which is amply confirmed by the cuneiform inscriptions unearthed by George Smith in 1873, depicting the tree, the fruit, the first parents, and the snake standing behind the lady. This illustration, say the archæologists, was drawn some fifteen hundred years before the Hebrews recorded their recollection of the appearance of Adam and Eve. Some even go so far as to suggest that Ezra, who passed a disagreeable summer, about 444 B.C., in Babylon, where the cylinders were found, drew rather freely upon these sources in order to make a suitable beginning for the revised version of the Hebrew Bible which subsequently he completed in Jerusalem.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Be that as it may; as we have already hinted, neither the snakes nor the ancestors of others possess for us an interest comparable to that attending our own, whose memories we shall continue to revere and cherish. But, while thus becomingly indulgent, we frankly confess impatience with those who persist in asserting that our snake was not a snake, but was an ape or a spider or something even more obnoxious. True, as the learned Dr. Adam Clarke observes, he must have walked erect, for this is necessarily implied in his judgment, and he must have possessed the power of speech in whatever language was then in vogue, because there is no indication that Eve was surprised when he accosted her. But it does not follow that he was an orang-outang simply because that obnoxious creature meets those requirements. Hissing is as intelligible to this day as gibbering, and the Chaldeans produce documentary evidence to show that the tempter, in his traditional form, stood upright. In any case, we prefer to believe, with the equally learned Dr. Henry, that the devil chose to act his part in a serpent, because "it is a specious creature and has a spotted, dappled skin"—*i. e.*, is more attractive than the ape and thus more likely to find favor in the eyes of a representative of the more artistic and susceptible sex.

That the snake was a male we feel far less certain. Indeed, there are many evidences, both external and internal, though not contained in Genesis, to the contrary. Ezra was an able and conscientious editor, but made errors of judgment, as other editors have done since, especially in discriminating between the essentials and non-essentials of a complete narrative. For years and years theologians have been trying in vain to reconcile the Jehovistic and Elohistic accounts of creation presented in Genesis. We are convinced that the necessity of making specious and unconvincing explanations would never have arisen if Ezra had not edited so closely. But his omission, whether from heedlessness or design, of any reference whatever to the very important part played by Lilith in the beginning of things seems hardly pardonable. The materials were at hand, drawn from the same sources as those which he utilized. The Chaldean inscriptions and the Arabic legends, extant in Babylon while he was engaged upon his great work, afford a quite simple solution of the vexatious problem. Lilith was created at the same time and in the same way as Adam. "Male and female created he them" and endowed them

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with equal rights and privileges. But, runs the chronicle, Adam, tactless and domineering, "began the first conversation by asserting that he was to be the master." The high-spirited lady indignantly repudiated this claim of superior authority. Whereupon, Adam insisting, Lilith uttered a certain spell called *schemhammphorasch,* of famous potency in Jewish folk lore, obtained wings thereby and "flew out of Eden and out of sight," or as stated subsequently in Revelations, not edited by Ezra, "To the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness." How subsequently Lilith married Samaël, who illumined a character not otherwise above reproach by treating her as an equal and left many descendants, some of whom are even now bombarding the Houses of Parliament, though interesting and important, is not germane to a consideration of the relative merits of snakes. But even in that early day it was recognized to be ill for man to live alone, so a second wife was formed, and this time out of Adam's rib in order that there should be no question of her subjection.

We perceive, therefore, that Ezra had only to tell the whole story to harmonize the two seemingly conflicting Biblical accounts of creation. His reasons for eliminating so material a portion are, as we have said, conjectural. It may be that he feared to offend the pride of his people by letting them know that their original ancestress was a second wife, or he may have been an anti-suffragist and desirous of withholding from the equal rights' movement the advantage of Scriptural authority. Accepting the Arabic version, which incidentally was derived from Jewish sources by converts of Mahomet from Cabbalism and Rabinism, we must conclude that now, strictly speaking, anti-suffragists should be regarded as daughters of Eve and suffragists as daughters of Lilith. To both would accrue certain satisfaction from such differentiation. Eve seems to have been the better woman, but credulous and stupid; while Lilith, though a disturber of domestic tranquillity and somewhat peremptory in manner, was far more intelligent and handsome, had beautiful hair and dressed like a queen in comparison with Eve in her traditionally simple raiment.

The question is, Was Lilith the snake? Comestor, the great historical scholar of the twelfth century, insists that, while the serpent stood erect, it had a virgin's head. Even as far back as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the eighth century was made a missal, which is still in existence, showing Eve taking the apple from Lilith, whose features are clearly defined and whose serpentine body entwines the tree. Pietro d'Orvieto illustrates the same idea in his finest fresco in Pisa and Michel Angelo's famous picture in the Sistine chapel is familiar. We cannot accept this masterpiece, however, beautiful as it is, as historically accurate, because of Adam's presence and his obvious preference for his first wife. Whatever may have been Adam's defects in character, his marital fidelity has never been questioned, and, though he bewailed bitterly the loss of Lilith, we have no doubt that, having once espoused Eve, he remained true to her, just as his sons continue faithful to their second wives to this day.

Even though we assume that Lilith did play the part attributed to her by the great painters, it does not follow that her intent was evil. As we have noted, she began life as a suffragist and was devoted to the cause. What more natural than that her heart should be saddened by the appearance of a sister living in subjection to man in ignorance of her inherent rights? And what more fitting to do, to demonstrate her zeal, than to strive to make a convert by giving her the means of acquiring the requisite knowledge? True, the results of her, perhaps, misguided efforts have not been altogether happy. As a consequence, we are forced to live in a world full of sin and misery; and yet would crowded existence in a state of ignorance, deprived of the joys and sorrow which we now have the intelligence to enjoy, be more endurable? It is a matter of taste, of course; but for ourselves, frankly, we would as lief be an angel.

Whether or not the devil remained in our first snake and was transmitted to his or her descendants is a question as yet undetermined. As we all know, plans were changed rapidly during the creative period. For example, the parents were expected to die if they ate of the forbidden fruit, but they did not, at least for a great many years; the serpent, too, was condemned to crawl on his belly and eat dust, whereas he walks on ribs which serve as feet and eats insects and frogs and toads and the like, to the great advantage of agricultural development. There surely does seem to exist in man a spontaneous enmity towards snakes, but there is no indication that the snake is instinctively antagonistic to men. Its attitude is rather of fear and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

apprehension, like that of other wild animals, which seek to avoid encounter, fight only in self-defence and considerately give notice of intention to strike. It is a question, too, whether man's unfriendliness is not attributable to the teachings of his youth that he is presumed to hate snakes and has Scriptural warrant for destroying them. The early passion for killing birds and rabbits is quite as strong as that for killing snakes, but is modified and controlled subsequently by custom and civilizing agencies opposed to brutality. The snake of to-day, therefore, clearly has good cause for grievance. He had no part in the tragedy of Eden and, being really stupid rather than exceptionally subtil, as he has been depicted, he cannot be expected to understand why he should have been singled out of all brute creation for the special animosity of superior man. But since, in point of fact, he has been the harassed victim of Scriptural authority all these years, surely it is not to be wondered at that he has become timid and miserable and incapable of development such, for example, as has transformed the fierce wolf into the tractable collie.

It is a matter of gratification, naturally, that our snake was considered to be as intelligent as his predecessors; but there was really no need of exceptional acumen to enable him to play his part successfully. If the Devil took possession of his body in order to accomplish a nefarious purpose, it was the Devil, not the snake, who framed the enticing argument for the unsuspecting Eve. If, again, it was Lilith who seized an opportunity to advance the cause of woman suffrage, clearly 'twas her keen appreciation of the power of curiosity that led to the fall. In either case the snake was a mere dupe used by one more cunning than himself to further a project in which he had no personal interest and whose method of accomplishment was foreign to his shy inclinations. If he had been as crafty as he has been reputed, can one suppose for a moment that he would have assumed a rôle which was certain to win the everlasting hatred of mankind? No; there have been and are good snakes and bad snakes just as there have been good Eves, like Godiva, or Goodeva, of Coventry, and as there are bad Eves, some of whom we know; but there is no real ground for the common belief that snakes are endowed with peculiar sapience. "Be ye wise as serpents" was a simple injunction to avoid trouble even as, "Be ye harmless as doves," although, of course, it is remotely possible

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the wide-spread recognition of the reputed sagacity of the serpent then holding forth at Abonotichus gave effectiveness to the comparison.

No snake that ever lived won greater fame for the time than Alexander's. Lucian tells the story. Apollonius, a master of the magic arts, had many disciples, among whom was a practising physician who lived in Abonotichus, a small town on the shore of the Black Sea. There Alexander was born of humble parentage and imbibed from the old doctor all that he had learned from Apollonius of medicine and magic. He was a lad of striking appearance, tall, handsome, with a fine head of hair, lustrous brown eyes and a voice sweet and limpid. "God grant," wrote Lucian, who knew him, "that I may never meet with such another. His cunning was wonderful, his dexterity matchless. His eagerness for knowledge, his capacity for learning and power of memory were equally extraordinary."

Such was the well-favored young peasant who sallied forth from his native town in search of fame and fortune. Soon he fell in with one Coconnas, a shrewd tipster for the races and somewhat of a juggler. The two rogues joined forces and meandered about telling fortunes. Arriving at Pella, they found a great number of huge, harmless snakes, which lived in the houses, played and slept with the children and destroyed poisonous rats. Alexander promptly purchased one of the largest, a veritable monster, so tame that it would coil about his body and remain in any desired position. Then he made a human face for it out of linen, painted it ingeniously and shaped it so that the mouth would open and shut by an arrangement of horse-hair, letting the forked tongue shoot in and out at the will of the master. Having no further use for Coconnas, he either administered poison to him or let him die from some infection and returned with his snake to his native town. There he declared himself a prophet and announced that the god Æsculapius was about to appear. The people were eager for a new divinity.

When the great day arrived Alexander pretended to discover in a puddle of water a goose-egg which he had placed there after removing the contents, substituting a small embryo snake just born and carefully sealing the shell with wax. When the multitude had gathered he broke the shell and produced the tiny creature, which in a few moments grew to be the monster from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pella by the simple process of substitution. Thereafter the big snake, believed to be Æsculapius, led a busy life. He gave seances, told fortunes in writing and even spoke freely, with the aid of the prophet's ventriloquial powers. Alexander grew rich and powerful, kept a small army of retainers and spies, wielded no little influence over the government even at Rome and died at a ripe old age in the fulness of his renown. What became of the snake nobody knows. Probably at the last the prophet despatched the faithful creature to prevent the discovery of his deception after his death.

The fact that some snakes eject poison against their enemies is held to justify their indiscriminate extinction. We fail to see how. They did not have the choice of their means of defence; they necessarily took what the Lord gave them and they act as instinct directs. Clearly reason is not their guide, else they would not notify an intended victim, but would strike in silence. It is pleasing to think that in this they are actuated by a high sense of honor and fairness, but we do not venture so much as a supposition that they possess an attribute so fine. It is more likely, as Darwin maintains, that the rattlesnake uses its rattle, the cobra expands its frill and the puff-adder swells and hisses in order to alarm the many birds and beasts which are known to attack the most venomous species, acting on the same principle which impels a hen to ruffle its feathers when a dog approaches its chickens. In any case, none of the traditional shrewdness or cunning is manifest in its performance.

Exceptional love of music would redound to the credit of any other living creature as indicative of refined taste, but in the maligned snake even this artistic attribute is a mark of derogation. Our own Quakers, for example, take up and endorse the diatribe of Epiphanius against the flute-players. "Observe the figure that the player makes in blowing. Does he not bend himself up and down to the right hand and the left, like unto the serpent? These forms hath the Devil used to manifest his blasphemy against things heavenly, to destroy things upon earth, to encompass the world, capturing right and left such as lend an ear to his seductions." And so on. But not a word do we hear in condemnation of the unregenerate birds that carol heedlessly even while the minister is painting the horrors of an unmentionable place.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ah, well! Let us hold fast to the old traditions. Adam may be properly censurable for leaving a nescient lady subject to her own susceptibilites at a critical time in the shaping of human history. Eve herself may not have been overbright. Still, such as our first parents were, they continue to be ours in fond recollection, and there we would keep them. Even Lilith, if Ezra had permitted, we would not lose.

"The rose and poppy are her flowers; for where
Is he not found, O Lilith, whom shed scent
And soft-shed kisses and soft sleep shall snare?
Lo! as that youth's eyes burned at thine, so went
Thy spell through him, and left his straight neck bent,
And round his heart one strangling golden hair."

Such as she there are and always will be. Who, if honest, would have it otherwise? So, too, with the snake in the garden. He may not have been the first and the devil may have been in him; but he is ours and we shall continue to think of the time when—

"his words, replete with guile,
Into her heart too easy entrance won:
Fixed on the fruit she gazed."

For him we crave no indulgence; consideration for his progeny is all we ask, and that for the reasons noted, namely, that the snake of to-day is neither vicious nor cunning, but shrinking and docile, and is actuated, not by intelligence, but by the instinct with which it was endowed.

Truth to tell, an illuminating illustration of this fact may be found in the episode which gave rise to these reflections. The family were at dinner when there came a tap at a door seldom opened. Winning no attention, it was repeated and again a third time, though more softly, and then the door was swung back and, behold! there was a snake, knocking at the portals of hospitality. Down upon its head, in conformity with the decree of tradition and with Ezra's understanding of Scriptural direction, crunched a British boot. It was a mother snake, who, having bravely overcome her fear of man, was seeking sustenance, not for herself perhaps, though she was starving, but more likely for the little ones that were found in the grass by the brook. Thus for once, at any rate, did the craftiness of the devil succumb to the instinct of motherhood.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED